

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, September 26, 1986

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 25, 1986.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Friday, September 26, 1986.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We recognize the difficulty, O God, of seeing clearly what we ought to do and where we want to go, and yet we recognize too that others disagree with us. We pray for the gift of patience and the gift of understanding. May we not lose that which we truly believe or the essentials of our faith, but always help us to see others with respect. Remind us each day, O loving God, of the dignity You have given to each person and the gracious blessings available to us all. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 394. Concurrent resolution to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill S. 1965.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3129. An act to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transportation programs, to expand and improve the

relocation assistance program, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5480. An act to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950 and to authorize appropriations for purposes of such Act.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3129) "An act to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, and for mass transportation programs, to expand and improve the relocation assistance program, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BURDICK, and Mr. MITCHELL, for title I of S. 2405 and title I of H.R. 3129, and for section 204, 55-mile-per-hour speed limit; section 202(a)(1) bridge replacement and rehabilitation program authorizations, (a)(2) elimination of hazards authorization, (a)(5) FHWA highway safety construction authorization, (a)(6) FHWA highway safety research and development authorization; section 209 use of certain reports as evidence; section 210 emergency call boxes; section 211 railroad-highway crossings authorization; section 215 railroad-highway crossing needs, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. DOLE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. LONG, and Mr. BENTSEN, for title III of S. 2405 and title V of H.R. 3129, extending the Highway Trust Fund, from the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GARN, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HECHT, Mr. PROXMIER, and Mr. DIXON, for provisions dealing with urban mass transportation (including title II of S. 2405 and title III of H.R. 3129), from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. HOLLINGS, for provisions dealing with highway safety (including title II of H.R. 3129 except for section 202(a)(1) bridge replacement and rehabilitation program authorizations, (a)(2) elimination of hazards authorization, (a)(5) FHWA highway safety construction authorization, (a)(6) FHWA highway safety research and development authorization; section 209 use of certain reports as evidence; section 210 emergency call boxes; section 211 railroad-highway crossings authorization; section 215 railroad-highway crossing needs), from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. CHILES, for provisions dealing with

the Uniform Relocation Act, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1965) entitled "An act to reauthorize and revise the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1935. An act to authorize the coastwise operation of certain passenger vessels;

S. 2062. An act to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse to be constructed and located in Newark, NJ, as the "Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse";

S. 2750. An act to establish a property tax fund for the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians in furtherance of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980, and for other purposes;

S. 2788. An act to designate the Federal building located in San Diego, CA, as the "Jacob Weinberger Federal Building";

S.J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 26, 1986, through November 1, 1986, as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week"; and

S.J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to designate the month of October 1986 as "Learning Disabilities Awareness Month."

DESIGNATION OF HON. JIM WRIGHT TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS UNTIL SEPTEMBER 30, 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 25, 1986.

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions until Tuesday, September 30, 1986.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that we will take 1 minute speeches following consideration of the rule on the immigration bill.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3810, IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND LEGALIZATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1985

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 559 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 559

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3810) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to revise and reform the immigration laws, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against the consideration of the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 302(f) and 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall continue not to exceed three hours, with one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and with thirty minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of each of the Committees on Agriculture, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by said committees now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the committee print, Committee on Rules, September 24, 1986, entitled "Amendments to H.R. 3810, the Immigration Control and Legalization Amendments Act of 1985", as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The substitute shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against the substitute for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 5(a) of rule XXI, and with the provisions of sections 302(f) and 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended are hereby waived. No amendment to the bill or to said substitute shall be in order except the amendments contained in the committee print, Committee on Rules, drafted to the page and line numbers of the substitute as contained in the committee print. Such amendments shall be considered only in the order in which they appear in the committee print and may only be offered by the sponsor designated in the committee print, or by the chairman of the appropriate committee, or his designee, where a committee is designated. Said amendments shall be considered as having been read and shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, but shall each be debatable

for the time specified in the committee print, Committee on Rules, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto, and all points of order against said amendments are hereby waived. If amendments numbered 5 and 6 are both adopted, only the latter shall be considered as having been finally adopted and reported back to the House. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Members may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text by this resolution, subject to the provisions of the preceding sentence of this resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, which may not contain instructions. After the passage of H.R. 3810, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1200 and to consider said bill in the House, and all points of order against the consideration of said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 302(f) and 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, are hereby waived. It shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 3810 as passed by the House, and all points of order against said motion for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 302(f) and 303(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and with the provisions of clause 5(a) of rule XXI are hereby waived. It shall then be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment to the bill S. 1200 and request a conference with the Senate thereon. It shall then be in order to consider in the House, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, a bill containing the text specified in section two of this resolution, if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee, debate on said bill shall continue not to exceed ten minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, or their designees, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on said bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, which may not contain instructions.

Sec. 2. The text of the second House bill made in order for consideration by this resolution is as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, section 3306(c)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out 'before January 1, 1988,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'before January 1, 1993,'."

□ 1010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLIN],

pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 559 is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3810, the Immigration Control and Legalization Amendments of 1986.

The rule provides 3 hours of general debate, with 1 hour allocated to the Committee on the Judiciary and 30 minutes to each of the Committees on Agriculture, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means. In each case, the committee's time will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the rule references a September 24, 1986, committee print of the Committee on Rules, which is the official document governing debate of H.R. 3810. The committee print contains the text of an amendment in the nature of a substitute which incorporates many committee and individual amendments that were presented to the Rules Committee. This substitute will be considered as original text.

The rule waives sections 302(b) and 303(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill and against the substitute. It also waives clause 5(a) of rule XXI against consideration of the substitute.

Rule 5(a) of rule XXI prohibits appropriations in a legislative bill. This bill provides for 100 percent reimbursement to States for costs associated with the implementation of the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlement Program, so-called SAVE, which would become effective upon enactment. That provision constitutes an appropriation in a legislative bill.

Section 302(f) of the Budget Act prohibits consideration of legislation which provides new discretionary budget authority, new entitlement authority, or new credit authority which exceeds the allocation of budget authority allocated to the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the legislation under section 302(b) of the Budget Act.

H.R. 3810 includes a number of provisions that make budget authority available immediately upon enactment. These include compensation for the appointment of a special counsel to investigate immigration-related unfair employment practices and a requirement that the Federal Government reimburse States and localities for the costs of incarcerating illegal aliens and certain Cuban nationals.

Since no allocation of new budget authority was made to the Judiciary Committee for fiscal year 1986, no measure would be in order within the jurisdiction of the Immigration Subcommittee which provides new budget authority for the current fiscal year.

Section 303(a) of the Budget Act prohibits consideration of legislation which contains new entitlement authority for a fiscal year until the budget resolution for that year has been adopted. One provision of the bill provides new entitlement authority for education assistance, for institutional reimbursements which will first take effect in fiscal year 1988.

The bill also provides that individuals who are legalized under its provisions are to be ineligible to receive most forms of public assistance for the 5-year period starting from the date of legalization. Entitlement to benefits for such individuals will first occur in fiscal year 1991.

Since both of these provisions constitute entitlement authority which first becomes effective in a fiscal year for which no budget resolution obviously has been adopted, they violate the provisions of section 393(a) of the Budget Act; but these provisions are key elements of the bill, which has been carefully crafted over many years; and it was felt necessary and proper to waive those particular provisions of the Budget Act in these particular instances.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee hesitates to grant waivers of the Congressional Budget Act. In this situation, however, the committee felt that the waivers included in the rule were justified in order to allow the House to work its will on the product of our committees who have found these entitlement programs to be necessary elements of a complete and responsible immigration reform package.

The committee print also contains the text of the amendment made in order under the rule, along with the time allocated for the debate of each amendment. The amendments are not amendable nor subject to a division of the question. Pro forma amendments are not allowed under the rule. Only those amendments printed in the committee print may be offered. The amendments must be offered in the order specified in the print and only by the designated Member, or in the case of a committee amendment, by the chairman or his designee. The rule also waives all points of order against the amendments made in order under the rule.

The rule provides that if both amendments numbered 5 and 6 are adopted, only the last amendment adopted is reported back to the House. The rule provides one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

Mr. Speaker, to allow the House to go to conference, the rule makes it in order to take S. 1200 from the Speaker's table and to consider the bill in the House. The rule waives sections 302(f) and 303(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the Senate bill. The rule makes in order a motion

to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 3810 as passed by the House. Clause 5(a) of rule XXI and sections 302(f) and 303(l) of the Budget Act are waived against that particular motion.

The rule makes in order a motion that the House insist upon its amendment to S. 1200 and request a conference.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration in the House of a House bill consisting of the text contained in section 2 of this resolution. This bill will extend until January 1, 1993, the exemption from the Federal unemployment tax of H-2 workers. All points of order are waived against consideration of the bill. The bill will be offered by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee. Debate on the bill is limited to 10 minutes, which will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their designee. Finally, the rule provides for a motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

Mr. Speaker, Members and various committees requested 107 amendments be made in order under this rule. The rule provides, in fact, for consideration of 54 of these amendments, or just over half of them. Twenty-two of these amendments would be made in order as original text of the substitute upon adoption of the rule. These were mostly amendments offered by various committees; a handful by individual Members.

Thirty-two of these amendments are to be offered individually as provided for by the rule, each with, as you have heard, a specified time limitation.

Some of the amendments disallowed, among the 53 disallowed, were disallowed because of redundancy or non-germaneness, but some of them for neither of those reasons, and you will hear argument about that.

The Rules Committee's actions were in great part, we believe, dictated and constrained by the situation in which we again find ourselves. Trying to process several major pieces of legislation in the waning days of the session, when there simply is not adequate time to deliberate as carefully and as well as in fact we should be doing.

The rule affords complete and full debate on the two basic issues in the bill; the two basic ingredients, as the Hessberg Commission back in its 1981 report, that has served as a basis and an impetus of congressional efforts at reform, felt were necessary parts of any immigration bill.

That is, employer sanctions and legalization of some illegals who have been here for many years, have put down their roots and made sizable contributions to our society.

The rule does seek to protect an agreement reached by the committee of jurisdiction on a third issue, which is at least as politically difficult and volatile as the first two—although it is of much less real importance and substance in the whole scheme of things when you look at the broad problem of illegal immigration into the United States.

That is, of course, the question of how to resolve the specific problem of allowing into this country each year a limited number of farmworkers to harvest the perishable crops that cannot, we are told, be adequately handled without some arrangement of this sort.

The rule in effect says:

Don't let the farmworker problem, which has been solved in this legislation in a manner acceptable to the interests most intimately concerned with it. That is, the growers and the laborers and the farmworkers themselves. Don't let this limited issue destroy our chances of getting real immigration reform.

Let us set aside for the moment the question of what exactly to do about the 200,000 or 250,000 or perhaps 300,000 or 350,000 persons needed to harvest these crops each year so that we may solve the basic and much larger problem of ensuring that the 1 to 2 million other illegals will no longer be able to come over the border every year into the United States.

The solution to the farmworkers problem—and there must be some solution found—will never be completely neat or rational or acceptable to many Members of Congress or to the public. It is by its very nature a messy and a complex problem with no terribly good solution.

□ 1020

Amazingly, however, after having been a stumbling block and an obstacle to getting the rest of the bill passed in earlier years, this year, as I have said, all of the folks involved, those representing the farm interests, those representing labor interests, have negotiated a solution that they at least all agree to. We are suggesting that we fence off for the moment that tricky and difficult area, protect their agreement, and get on with solving the real immigration problem. And that is what this particular rule is designed to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILSON] has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. QUILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the rule has been ably explained by the gentleman from California, and I would be redundant to repeat the provisions of the rule.

Let me say, first of all, however, that the Committee on Rules tried hard,

sincerely, and made every effort to work out a workable rule so that this bill could pass the House.

I feel, however, that two mistakes were made in granting the rule. One, the Committee on Rules did not allow the Lungren amendment to be considered on the floor. Second, they did not allow a motion to recommit with instructions.

I am going to ask a "no" vote on the previous question so these two amendments can be added in a subsequent rule.

I feel that the Lungren amendment should be fully debated and a decision made on the floor of the House.

I think it is tying the minority's hands without the motion to recommit with instructions.

This is beginning to be a habit of the Rules Committee to bypass the minority and make us feel like we are not really a part of the House proceedings although we sit in on caucuses in the Rules Committee and try to be helpful in every way that we can.

I think that recognition is due us. We should have it. I shall fight for it and ask the Members of this body to vote "no" on the previous question.

I remember in 1984 when the immigration bill was before this House. For 7 long days in June we hammered away at this important legislation, which is important, we all know, and we desperately need a revision of our immigration laws. It passed the House, went to conference and languished there and died. Here we are in the eve of adjournment, and this important legislation is coming before us with a rule that is going to be hotly debated. Already I have more requests for time than I can grant. Then, should it pass the House, and I hope it will if these two amendments are made in order, then I cannot predict what the outcome will be.

At the most, we have only 2 more weeks before adjournment, and for the life of me I do not see how in the world this bill could make its way to final congressional approval and then to the President of the United States.

So I would urge the Members of this body to look closely at the Lungren amendment. The argument is against the Schumer amendment. The Schumer amendment is designed to help the farmers. We all know they need help. There is no question about it, farm labor is important.

But what it brings into the picture is that an illegal alien working on a farm for 60 days is automatically granted citizenship. I know of legal aliens, legal immigrants from other countries who are here on legal passports and visas whose time is running out, and they have to wait on a list to become American citizens or else they are deported. And if they cannot reach that number on their list, they are deported. They have been battling in the

United States to find people, some of whom are members of civic clubs, some of whom are a part of their communities, but they are denied citizenship because of the rules and regulations that this Congress has imposed. Then when we try, and we try hard, there is no exception to the rule.

We do have a sympathetic Subcommittee on Immigration. I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] who has an open heart and an open mind. I feel it is most unfair to grant an illegal alien who has worked for 60 days full citizenship and deny others the same right.

So that will be fully debated on the rule, I am sure.

I hope that the bill can be passed because we have a tremendous problem and we need a helping hand to get it corrected. These are issues that can be resolved on the House floor and let them come as they will, let the decision be as you would have it.

I understand, and I am not quoting, because I have not heard the chairman of the Judiciary Committee say that the Schumer amendment would help passage of this bill. I do not think there is any question about it because in the farm belt we need farm help. But at the same time, I feel that the rule is in jeopardy unless the Lungren amendment is made in order.

So we are at an impasse. Let the House decide and work its will.

Mr. Speaker, I have several requests for time, and I will be glad to yield at any time that the gentleman from California would ask me to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BADHAM].

Mr. BADHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would commend, of course, the people who have had a hand in trying to bring this legislation to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is absolutely essential, absolutely essential that we do something in legislation to stem the flow of illegals into this country, not because simply they are illegal but we have to have a political and moral responsibility to be a friend, an ally, and a good neighbor particularly to our neighbor to the south, the Republic of Mexico.

Some years ago because of exploitation, so-called, and so forth, we ended a program that legally allowed people to come into the United States who wanted to for good purposes, and so forth, and now they are doing the same thing, only they are illegal, and they act as a screen, unfortunately, unwillingly and unknowingly in many cases, to bring in smugglers, bandits all sorts of undesirable people who use as a screen the poor agricultural worker.

This bill or any immigration bill in any form will not be the answer to this problem. It will require disincentives, it will require legalization, it will require amnesty; in addition it will require investment and cooperation on both sides of the border area to stem this flow that is damaging our economy and the Mexican economy.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have to have something, we have to have something; it is an urgent state of emergency that we face at our border. We have to have something. This rule is unfortunately a particularly onerous rule that will really deny accurate action being done, but we have to have something. I will vote against this rule, and I hope we will have a chance to perfect this rule so that we might move ahead with this absolutely essential legislation and not for whatever reason, ill-meaning or ill-wanted, put this off.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say if I had had a hand in writing this rule, I would have written it differently. I would have allowed certain amendments made in order that are not made in order, and I would have excluded from the text material which is included in the text.

However, we are where we are today at the 11th hour of the Congress and the 11th hour for this legislation. As imperfect and as flawed as the rule is, and as difficult as it is for some of our colleagues to approve, I hope that we pass it, I hope that we do so without adopting the gentleman's effort which will be to rewrite the rule; I hope we can go to conference quickly and I hope we can receive a conference report and send something to the President for signature this year.

So much talk has been generated about the so-called Berman-Panetta-Schumer compromise that I think people and Members of the Congress might lose sight of the fact that this bill is far more than an agricultural labor bill.

The bill contains many important provisions. My friend from California, Mr. BEILENSEN, has outlined them: Employer sanctions to curtail the flow of undocumented aliens into the country by denying them the jobs they are seeking; legalization to do justice to some of the people who are here who have been here the longest and have the deepest roots, who have the best character but who have entered illegally, would under our bill be legalized. Border enforcement, antismuggling efforts are enhanced; there are several other miscellaneous provisions in the bill, and there is the Schumer-

Berman-Panetta compromise on agricultural labor which is a minor part of the bill but which has become the most vexing part, and let me address generally that issue.

I was about the only Democrat in our committee at the markup who opposed this compromise. Everyone else on my side of the aisle went along grudgingly and at times shame-facedly with this compromise. They did so because they were urged to do so by the authors by saying that if so much as a jot or a tittle of this compromise were changed, the whole bill goes down the drain. I did not believe it. I opposed it. However I opposed it unsuccessfully.

Once the compromise left our committee and was open to the light of day, its multitudinous and very serious flaws were uncovered and were addressed and, of course, to a firestorm of criticism.

I am still very much uncomfortable with the twin premises of this compromise. One is to grant immediate permanent residency to a great group of people who are here but only those who work in agriculture. The second premise is to permit the growers to have an ample almost unlimited supply of nondomestic, non-U.S. labor to harvest their crops. However, the Rules Committee at my request, and I appreciate their help, has incorporated into the text of H.R. 3810, five separate amendments which I have offered which I think correct or could be further corrected in conference, five of the most egregious flaws in this particular compromise.

Other shortcomings were identified by other committees which had sequential referral, and they are dealt with in the course of the rule. However, I still feel even if the bill was approved with my amendments, that compromise is still not acceptable, and I would urge a change in the conference. But all I can ask of my colleagues today is, rather than defeat the rule, rather than try to rewrite the rule, which is a perilous exercise, a risky business, I would ask my colleagues to approve this rule, let us have our debate, let us go to the conference with the Senate and send a bill to the President this year.

If I had written the rule, I would have written differently.

I would not have made the same amendments in order which the rule makes in order. And, I would have excluded from the text of H.R. 3810 some of the amendments which the rule includes.

However, we are where we are. As imperfect and flawed as the rule is, I hope it passes. And, I hope we pass H.R. 3810 and complete a conference and send a final product to President Reagan for signature this year.

So much talk and so much controversy have been directed to the Schumer-Berman-Panetta agricultural labor compromise, that we could lose sight of the other provisions of the

bill. The bill is much more than an agricultural labor bill despite what you may have heard and been led to believe.

H.R. 3810 contains these important provisions:

Employer Sanctions: To curtail the illegal flow of aliens into our Nation. H.R. 3810 makes it unlawful for employers to knowingly offer jobs to undocumented aliens.

Legalization: To do justice to people and to end a shadow society, the status of some of the aliens who have entered the United States illegally, who have been here the longest, have deepest roots and who are not excludable; that is of good character and habit is legitimized.

Border enforcement: To strengthen the Immigration Service's border enforcement and antismuggling efforts more money and more personnel are provided by H.R. 3810.

Miscellaneous: H.R. 3810 corrects flaws in and strengthens the Immigration and Nationality Act in many other ways.

Agricultural labor: Only lastly does H.R. 3810 treat agricultural labor. As I have said, this is not just an agricultural labor bill, please be assured of that.

Now, let me address for a moment the Schumer-Berman-Panetta agricultural labor compromise.

I opposed the compromise at the Judiciary Committee markup—the only Democrat to do so I am sorry to report. Everyone else on my side of the aisle went along grudgingly, and at times shamefacedly with the compromise. They were told to accept the compromise, jot and tittle, because to alter the compromise was to destroy it and the bill itself.

Once, however, the compromise left the committee and was subjected to public scrutiny and careful study, its multitudinous and serious flaws, which I tried to point out to the committee, came to light and produced a veritable firestorm of opposition and concern.

I am still uncomfortable with the dual premises of the compromise: To grant immediate permanent residence to agricultural workers—to benefit the workers—and to guarantee growers an ample supply of nondomestic agricultural workers—to benefit the growers.

However, the Rules Committee, pursuant to my request, and in response to the firestorm of concern over the agricultural labor compromise, has folded into the bill, if the rule is adopted, five separate amendments I authored which cure—or at least open to fuller cure in conference—the most egregious flaws in the Schumer-Berman-Panetta compromise.

Other shortcomings in the compromise are corrected or ameliorated by several amendments the rule makes in order or which are incorporated into H.R. 3810.

But, the Schumer-Berman-Panetta language still need further modifications which I will strive to make in conference.

Now, however, rather than defeating the rule and going back to square 1, or even trying to rewrite the rule which is risky business, I would urge my colleagues to adopt this rule, pass H.R. 3810 and move it to conference.

Let's not let our disagreements on one part of H.R. 3810 keep us from moving forward on the far broader subject of immigration reform.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

I do not like one bit the procedure under which this bill has been brought before us. Sure minority rights should be protected, but that does not include the right to take to conference a provision that is opposed by the majority. I think a majority of the House opposes the Schumer proposal.

This perverse protection is what we have here today. I urge my colleagues to join me in politely but firmly telling the Rules Committee to give us a vote on the Schumer proposal by defeating the previous question.

The Schumer proposal is a deft piece of politics. But it's a sweetheart deal, pure and simple. It does not represent the public interest, and it does not represent the will of the House. If it did, we could have voted on it.

Like Tantalus, we can see this deal and all its flaws, but we cannot reach it. Members in the four committees that considered this bill on referral were told that amendments to this provision were not possible. We could not attempt to amend it, because doing so would recommit the bill to the other committee with jurisdiction, delaying and effectively killing the bill.

That was in late July. So much for delay.

Now, on the floor, when delay is not the issue, we are told that amendments would upset a delicate compromise. A compromise between whom? Between two interests, neither of which represents the interests of my constituents or most Americans.

So much for compromise.

Since the public interest was not party to this compromise, we should not compromise its interest. Let's vote down the previous question, and vote for a bit of democracy.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the committees that have been involved in the House in moving this legislation forward, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules. Particularly I want to thank and commend the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. MAZZOLI, for his long and diligent efforts in support of this legislation, and the gentleman from California, Mr. LUNGREN, and all the others who have worked to make this possible. I think they have done a very good job with this bill, for the most part. It should be moved forward through the House, hopefully through the conference, and we should move it on to become law.

□ 1035

My major concern with the committees is, first, that the Judiciary Committee waited so long to report it, because it may get trapped in the rush now to end this session; and, of course, the Rules Committee came close to having a totally fair rule, but gets no

cigar, because it missed it on one very vital point.

This is a very politically difficult bill to deal with. Many of us come from districts that are not directly affected, immediately at least, and my district is one of those. But it is a crisis. It is a timebomb waiting to happen. We must deal with this issue, and I think we all know that in our hearts. And if we can move this legislation forward in a fair manner, I think it will go through the House of Representatives.

But I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can offer a fair substitute rule, one that would give a chance to the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN], and one that would also preserve the traditional absolute right of the minority to have a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The substitute rule would allow a substitute amendment by Mr. LUNGREN for the Schumer, and in case you are not familiar with the issue, I will be just very brief in describing it.

The Lungren amendment is identical to the Wilson amendment passed in the other body and comparable to the so-called Panetta-Morrison provisions passed by the House last year. Essentially, it establishes a special guest-worker program over the next 3 years, during which up to 250,000 workers can be admitted each year for up to 9 months to harvest perishable crops if sufficient domestic workers are not available.

The Schumer amendment, on the other hand, permits workers who have worked at least 60 days, and not necessarily all of those days, between May of last year and May of this year to qualify for resident alien status and to qualify for Federal benefits. I looked at this provision. I tried to find a way to support it, but, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot, because I think it will exacerbate the very problem we are trying to deal with here.

The rule left out Lungren and the motion to recommit with or without instructions, but it made in order 30 other amendments. The gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is no minor player in this issue. The gentleman has been very diligent. The gentleman has been highly involved and respectable in the way he has handled himself. The gentleman has been a major contributor to making it possible to move it forward. Yet the gentleman is cut out. Why was this 1 amendment not allowed while 30 were allowed? Very simply, I can state it this way. In fact, some of my friends on this side of the aisle would say to you honestly it is because if the Lungren amendment is made in order, the will of this body will be to pass it. Schumer will be knocked out and Lungren will pass.

Now what have we done? The Rules Committee, knowing the will of the

House is to pass an amendment, says, well, we are not going to make it in order. What kind of procedure is this? It is not fair. It is the only remaining major issue that needs to be addressed. I suspect that some of those who want to see this whole immigration reform issue die have lured us into this snare, trying to kill it; not the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN] of the Rules Committee, who has been very, very, I think, sincere in his efforts to craft a good rule here. But it is not fair. Defeat the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the various committees involved on bringing us an immigration bill, and the Rules Committee on clearing it for floor action under this modified open rule. I think we've come a long way from the prolonged process we suffered through in the last Congress. I would like to think this bodes well for enactment despite the short time remaining in this Congress.

I know this bill contains several politically difficult issues that we would all rather not confront in an election year. But I strongly feel that this is one of those extraordinary crises in which the national interest must take precedence over our immediate political concerns. And make no mistake about it, illegal immigration is a ticking timebomb that must be defused now or its explosive repercussions will rip through the heartland of this country in the future.

Having said that, I want to join the gentleman from Tennessee in urging defeat of the previous question so we might offer a substitute rule that does just two things: First, it would make in order the Lungren substitute for Schumer language in the bill on the issue of guest-workers; and second, it would restore the minority's traditional right under House precedents to offer a motion to recommit of its choosing, and not be confined to a straight motion to recommit without instructions.

The Lungren amendment is identical to the Wilson amendment passed in the other body, and comparable to the so-called Panetta-Morrison provisions passed by this House in the last Congress. Essentially, it establishes a special guest-worker program over the next 3 years during which up to 350,000 workers can be admitted each year for up to 9 months to harvest perishable crops if sufficient domestic workers are not available.

This would replace the existing Schumer language in this bill which permits workers who have worked at least 60-days between May of last year and May of this year to qualify for resident alien status and qualify for Federal benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I won't deny that this rule comes close to being fair, making in order as it does some 30 amendments that span the broad range of issues and alternatives involved in this complex and comprehensive bill. But, while the rule may come close, the Rules Committee gets no cigar. Instead, the minority got the cigar—only it happened to be an exploding cigar that blasted away our right to offer even one alternative to the Schumer language, and deprives us of our historical right and prerogative to offer a motion to recommit with instructions. Denying the Lungren amend-

ment on guest-workers deprives a bipartisan majority on both sides of a vote on an amendment that carried in the last Congress. Let's rectify this denial of majority rights by defeating the previous question and adopting a new rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is a very unfair rule. It does not permit the House a separate vote on the most controversial part of the bill, the Schumer-Berman-Panetta guest-worker provision. Along with a number of my colleagues, I asked that Rules Committee permit a vote to strike that provision. We are not being given that opportunity.

I am opposed to the expanded guest-worker provision.

What options do I have? Not many. If the previous question motion is defeated, we will be faced with a rule that will include an even worse guest-worker provision that the other body approved. So, I must support the motion for previous question.

Of course, the House could defeat the rule itself. Yet, that would be tantamount to defeating immigration reform. For 4 years—two of them serving on the Immigration Subcommittee—I have supported a strong immigration reform bill. The bill itself has many provisions for which I have fought. My constituents want immigration reform. All Americans want immigration reform, and this may be our last chance. I, therefore, will have to vote for the rule so that we will be able to vote on the substance, the good substance, of the legislation. I realize that, in so doing, I and my colleagues will be giving the California growers what they want and what they should not receive. You do not get an addict off drugs by feeding his habit. Illegal alien workers are the drugs of agriculture, and this bill keeps up agriculture's supply.

I don't like it, but that is the situation. In the end, immigration reform—regaining control of our borders, reducing the ultimate influx of illegal refugees—is our primary goal. This bill will achieve that even with the unwanted provisions.

Mr. QUILLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, we are again facing the conclusion of another Congress. This is a time when the Nation needs strong legislative leadership. Unfortunately what we are getting is legislative brinkmanship.

We are beginning the great rush to judgment on so many critical pieces of legislation and leaving behind a path of destruction unequalled since the Soviets invaded Afghanistan.

The House is suffering from ineptitude. It is a \$1 billion organization of immense proportion with immense responsibility run like a popcorn stand outside the county courthouse.

Look at the record. We are finally getting around to immigration and at the last minute you want to play a game of partisan brinkmanship.

The majority has stalled, delayed and sidetracked immigration reform for almost a year, just as you did omnibus crime reform, which we finally got enacted on a motion to recommit, no less.

Immigration, though is a mild symptom of the disease.

The military construction appropriation was passed by the House in June and it went to conference on August 15. Where is it? What have you done with it?

The debt limit is once again threatening to bring us to the brink this year, with all of the horrifying complications involving disinvestment of Social Security and the rest. It went through the Senate on August 9.

Superfund has been in conference almost a year. Nothing should take that long. Nothing.

And finally, there's the budget. I don't think we have complied with our own laws in the 12 years the Budget Act has been in existence. We go on road shows, and stir up a lot of political dust, but in the end what we pass could have been more skillfully done in a mock Congress in an Illinois grade school.

We just refuse to meet deadlines required by law. We delay and we stall and we procrastinate. Reconciliation should have been done prior to July 4, and we just got around to it this week.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has to some day move into the 20th century before the 20th century passes us by.

We need better management, better communication, better cooperation, new technology, and streamlined procedures. Finally, we need less partisanship, brinkmanship, and political gamesmanship in the decisionmaking process.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California agrees wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this bill was referred sequentially to the Committee on Agriculture. We studied it and we have one proposed amendment which would allow equity for agriculture as far as immigration officers coming on the land without a warrant.

The so-called Schumer-Berman-Panetta compromise, we looked at it and we found out that it was adequate in an inadequate way, but yet, under the

art of the possible, it was the best that we could do, and the committee decided to go along with the compromise.

So I have a difficult situation in that I have concerns about other parts of the legislation. But as far as the Committee on Agriculture and the responsibility which I have there, we are satisfied that the legislation is adequate, and I would suggest that we vote for the rule in that respect.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, normally I vote against this type of rule, and it pains me to oppose my good friend and leader, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN]. But I am going to argue to support the fencing off of the agricultural worker provisions. This position is supported by most agriculture organizations, including the American Farm Bureau.

□ 1045

The two basic reasons for my support of the Schumer package: No. 1, and this is the most important, it is the only way to get to conference. The other body has already approved the Wilson amendment, an updated version of the Panetta-Morrison guest-worker program adopted overwhelmingly by this House in 1984.

Again, this approach taken by the rule is the only way to get to conference on the agricultural issue. The No. 2 reason is this: Agricultural interests have pledged to not stand in the way of meaningful immigration reform, and this is the driving force that brings us to this particular point today, and it is a difficult one.

We have accepted the political facts of life; the only road to conference is with the Schumer proposal. Otherwise, we will never get there.

Reluctantly, I ask for support for the rule and believe that support is justified under the circumstances.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make this point: The minority has made a big issue out of the fact that the Lungren amendment is not made in order by this rule, but let me point something out. I asked the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment to completely strike any guest-worker provision whatsoever because I do not believe the growers of California or any other State need guest-workers. I think they ought to hire American citizens like everybody else is going to have to do.

They did not make my amendment in order because they knew if my

amendment succeeded, it would kill the bill. They did not make Mr. LUNGREN's amendment in order, which would lift 350,000 people who work here for 11 months of the year because they knew if his amendment succeeded, it would kill the bill.

Instead, what they left in the bill was a very difficult, delicate and hard-to-arrive-at compromise arrived at between the growers and between those people that work in the fields. That is difficult to understand at first blush, but it is logical as you begin to examine it further.

I would like to have been able to vote against any kind of guest-worker provision, but I cannot have all that I want. Mr. LUNGREN and Mr. MICHEL, you cannot have all that you want, either. We have a rule today that will give us an immigration bill, and that is what I want.

I urge the Members to vote for the previous question and for the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER].

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as a California Member of the House, I can say that probably the most profound problem in our State as it reflects on our 45 Members here is immigration reform. I accept that.

When I appeared before the Rules Committee asking for permission to have an amendment made in order, which, by this rule, was denied, I heard one of the most incredible presentations by colleagues of mine relating to their Schumer proposal that I want to share with my colleagues now.

I do not know whether the gentleman from California, Mr. BERMAN, is here now or not; yes, he is here. But, I was sitting behind the gentleman and I heard him use the word "whacko." He said, "It only seems whacko." I will give the version Mr. BERMAN says he uttered, namely, "It only seems whacko."

It only seems whacko, that is, the Schumer proposal in this bill. I suspect the reason Mr. BERMAN used the words "It only seems whacko," was because of the ridiculous impact it is going to have upon the finances of the U.S. Government if this immigration bill, in the form that is now before the House, is approved.

Can you imagine that if you have worked in agriculture for 60 days, within May 1, 1985 to May 1, 1986, you have established eligibility for permanent residency in the United States. You will get a green card. What is more, you will be entitled to welfare benefits, all that exist under the law today.

If the taxpayers of America find out about this, they are going to be incensed at what in the world are we

doing. They can understand the necessity of recognizing we need guest-workers coming in for agricultural jobs in America which our citizens choose not to take, but they do not choose to pay welfare benefits to these friends that come into our society.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege: I believe my name was mentioned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from California cannot be recognized for that purpose.

The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER] has expired.

Mr. DANNEMEYER. We should support the effort of the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGEN] to defeat the previous question and vote down this rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB].

Mr. DAUB. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly try, in 1 minute, to state my feelings on the rule. I do plan to be active in the debate on the bill.

Once upon a time, immigration reform looked like it would finally get the attention it deserved from this Congress. I was particularly hopeful of that. I spent a good deal of my professional life as an immigration lawyer. It is high time we do something.

Now we find ourselves being asked to consider a prepackaged, special-interest-laden bill which is nothing less than ridiculous. Chain migration, out-year numbers that could total 70 million, abandoned. I offered an amendment before the Rules Committee not made in order. Lungren not made in order; Hughes not in order; motion to strike Schumer not in order; motion to recommit with instructions not in order; El Salvadorian voluntary extended departure, stuck in the bill at the last minute.

Vote for Lungren.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the previous question. We all know that immigration is a complex and troubling issue. It certainly is for me as a southerner and as a conservative.

We have a chance now to get immigration reform; let us not blow this opportunity. Immigration reform, as we know, is long overdue; we should have done this a long time ago. Many of the problems we face today are compounded because we have failed to act. Now is our chance to act. This is a fair compromise.

In my short time in Congress, I cannot remember a time when the American Farm Bureau and the AFL-CIO have agreed on a measure. The Farm Bureau is one of the strongest if not the strongest single group in my State of Tennessee. They are an outstanding group. The quarter of a million farm families they represent in Tennessee I think would be pleased with this compromise.

Nobody gets their way entirely, but this is the best we can get. A third point: This is a leadership vote. This is a relatively small element that they are complaining about on the minority side out of this large, large bill. Let us not let the tail wag the dog on this measure. We are in the waning days of Congress; let us get on with genuine reform.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PASHAYAN].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, recognizing its flaws, but still recognizing that if we allow this issue to be laid at the side of this aisle for defeating the immigration bill, it will come back to haunt us deeply. It is the most important issue in my district, and certainly I am anxious for a successful immigration bill.

I would have written the rule differently, but that is not possible. We need to get it to conference. Support the rule. Hopefully, the Wilson amendment will replace the Schumer amendment in conference. Certainly, we need to have the bill.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASHAYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, we in this country are faced with a real crisis. We must bring about immigration reform. Since I have been here, we have been desperately fighting to see legislation pass this House, get to conference and get to the President's desk.

I know that my preference would be the Wilson amendment because I think that best addresses the crisis that we are facing. Nevertheless, we have only one vehicle which will get us to conference, and for that reason, I rise in support of the previous question so that we might consider the rule.

One of its more controversial provisions is the so-called Schumer-Berman-Panetta agricultural worker program. This provision will enable growers of perishable agriculture to meet their labor needs. I must admit, however, that the provision is not perfect. In all candor I would prefer the Wilson provision approved by

the Senate. It is regrettable that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee foreclosed any consideration whatsoever of that option. Nevertheless, the provision represents the best alternative that could be put together to address a complex and difficult problem.

Without the Schumer amendment the largest industry in my State would be jeopardized. Unable to depend totally on domestic labor, growers would be forced to reduce production of perishable commodities. This in turn would dry up agricultural exports and increase imports of foreign grown produce. I need not remind my colleagues of the effect of such a situation on the U.S. trade imbalance.

The growers in my State are generally small family farmers for whom the existing foreign worker programs are cumbersome and costly. The provision in H.R. 3810 would set up a system based on free market principles. Workers would be able to work for whomever they liked and growers could better attract the workers they need through paying competitive wages.

The agricultural worker problem is wrought with complexity. Yet avoiding the issue could spell the demise of perishable agriculture in this country. I have grave concerns, too, about the blanket granting of amnesty which the rule grants. Mr. Speaker, this rule also allows me to join my colleague, Mr. MOORHEAD, in offering an amendment to increase the border patrol by 50 percent. While not a panacea, this provision will help to stem the flow of illegals and potential terrorists. We should move ahead with the process but I hope we can improve this rule.

I urge my colleagues to join me in resolving these troublesome issues.

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, the special interests that were referred to by one of my colleagues are thousands of small farmers and their families throughout the West, especially in California. They are the ones that need permanent protection by any kind of immigration bill.

The Lungren provision does not offer permanent protection; it offers protection only for 3 years. Therefore, the only vehicle to protect these thousands of small farmers—these are small, family farmers—the only vehicle before us today to protect them in conference is the Schumer amendment. I rise in support of it.

□ 1055

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DANNEMEYER], who spoke earlier not only misrepresented my comments before the Committee on Rules, but he misrepresented the bill.

As a matter of fact, and as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] has pointed out, as the Committee on Ways and Means and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB] certainly know, the welfare benefits that the people who would come under the program refer to as the Schumer-Panetta-Berman program were denied and are in the base of the bill. They are not eligible for the traditional AFDC welfare benefits.

As the gentleman from California knows, because he was there before the Committee on Rules, I said this bill, on serious examination, and this proposal make compelling substantive and political sense.

We have tried it the other way in 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984, and there has been no immigration reform. For people who want immigration reform, let us try it a different way, a way that brings disparate parties together and works on these solutions together.

I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules did a railroad job on this rule. The effect of doing a railroad job on this rule is to make a bill loaded down with contentious and divisive issues even more contentious and more divisive which will ensure that a conference will not succeed.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DAUB] ticked off a whole host of things that the Committee on Rules did, including putting Moakley-DeConcini in and sheltering it from a motion to strike.

But in another instance, on the issue of warrantless searches of fields, the Committees on Agriculture and the Judiciary have had a difference of agreement. The Committee on Agriculture supported the search warrant; the Committee on the Judiciary, for good reason, did not. Yet the committee on Agriculture's version is put in this bill and sheltered from a motion to strike.

So even when there are disagreements between 2 committees, this rule prevents a vote of the House to determine which committee's viewpoint is justified.

These kinds of issues are going to make a conference almost impossible to reach agreement in the few days left of this session. This kind of rule, I believe in effect, will kill immigration reform vitally needed for 2 more years.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purpose of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES].

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on H.R. 3810. Immigration reform is a complex and difficult issue. Addressing the many competing interests is not easily achieved. But I strongly believe that the rule we

are voting on here today represents a fair and realistic effort to balance these interests.

Two years ago, I voted against the House immigration reform bill. I voted against the bill because I believed that employer sanctions would result in widespread discrimination. I voted against the bill because I believed that the massive guest-worker program that was adopted would lead to abuse and exploitation of both foreign and American workers. I voted against the bill 2 years ago because I did not believe it represented fair or meaningful immigration reform.

Because of our efforts to ensure that immigration reform did not result in discrimination and abuse, Hispanics like myself have been accused of being obstructionist. We have been criticized for subverting the will of the majority. When I opposed the rule on the immigration bill in the last Congress, I was told that although the rule was not perfect—the time for immigration reform had come.

I find it ironic that some of these same critics are now attempting to deny the House an opportunity to vote for legislation that has been approved by virtually every committee of jurisdiction. The rule is not perfect. But it does attempt to maintain a realistic balance of competing interests. And to borrow a line from my critics—the time for immigration reform has come.

If the rule we are considering here today is adopted, I am not certain how I will vote on final passage. I am still troubled by the discrimination that could result from employer sanctions. I am also not convinced that any foreign agricultural workers should be imported to pick our crops. I am certain, however, that if the rule is not adopted, the opportunity for approving acceptable legislation will be lost.

If the House does not adopt this rule, the delicate balance that has been crafted will be destroyed and immigration reform will once again be left for another day. I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and provide the House an opportunity to vote for a fair and meaningful immigration bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this most undemocratic rule.

Again, we find ourselves going through the semiannual sadistic process of trying to do something about meaningful immigration reform in this country. I am sick and tired of hearing speaker after speaker come down here and say that getting this bill out is more important than the democratic process.

The Committee on Rules has completely stopped the democratic process from going forward and I will say to the Members that democracy, the

democratic process, is more important than any statute, any change or any bill coming through this Congress of the United States.

It is sadistic and anybody who believes for 1 moment that we are going to take this bill to conference and that we are going to come back with a good immigration bill before the close of this Congress next week or the following week must have come in this morning's mail.

It is not going to happen and I urge all of the Members that the only way that we can really make our feelings known and come up with a decent bill that will give us any chance of meaningful immigration reform this year is to defeat this awful rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, having worked on immigration reform, I, too, regret that we take this up in the closing days of the session. But that is the case.

Yesterday we dealt with tax reform; today we deal with immigration reform. There are some similarities. Like tax reform, if we are going to do immigration reform, it has to be comprehensive and deal with a broad number of areas to do it properly.

Like tax reform, you cannot provide an open rule that allows every amendment to come in and destroy the careful compromises that have been put together. That is the reality of dealing with comprehensive legislation in this body if you want to enact it.

On the compromise itself, let me say this: Today there are in the area of 300,000 to 350,000 undocumented who work in agriculture. The choice of this institution is either to allow the continuation of having illegals work in agriculture, to bring in another 300,000 to 350,000 guest-workers in this country to solve that issue, or to try to legalize and provide green cards to those who work in agriculture.

Do the right thing. Support this compromise and support the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, if the Members love amnesty, they are really going to love the Schumer amendment because that is what it is. That is what the provision is, a second legalization or a second amnesty that is far worse than the regular legalization that is in this bill.

It is the one thing in the legislation that is going to cause this Member, who has always supported immigration reform, to vote against the whole package if we cannot amend at this time. I hate to say that.

The only way we can get a decent product out of this body is by voting

on and with the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN], to vote down the previous question, and, if necessary, vote down the rule.

We also do not have the opportunity to get an extended voluntary departure under this rule. They are going to put this in to let Salvadorans who are in this country, some 500,000, stay. If you vote for the rule, you are voting to do that when, in fact, they can go back home and everything is jim-dandy and fine. I have been down there; I have seen it.

It is wrong not to let us debate these issues. It is wrong not to let us have the opportunity to get at the Schumer amendment and other things by this choke rule that is going to keep us from that opportunity today.

I urge the Members in the name of fairness to vote down the previous question on this rule and to vote against the rule if necessary.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the debate today is not dissimilar from the debate yesterday.

We have a real crisis in this country about immigration. Every year, 2 million people cross the borders here illegally. That is something we cannot have any longer.

What do we do about it? Mr. SIMPSON and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] have put together a comprehensive bill. That bill is ready to become law, ready to become law if we can put aside our petty differences and say, "I like this agricultural provision better than that agricultural provision," and say, "This does not exactly meet my needs and that one does."

We can have real immigration reform if we pass this rule, if we vote for the previous question. It is that simple.

If we do nothing, no matter how much the Members like or dislike either the Wilson-Lungren proposal or the Schumer proposal, we have no reform.

If we pass this rule and pass the previous question, we are finally doing something in a fair and humane way about immigration reform.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on both questions.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

□ 1105

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, we have before us here a truly extraordinary rule. I can understand and I share the frustration of my colleagues over this highhanded rule. Nevertheless, I am going to ask my colleagues to support it.

I thought long and hard about the position I should take and concluded the most important element is that the process goes forward. This is painful, inasmuch as it is a position apart from most of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee and particularly those who share my commitment to immigration reform and who have worked so hard on this issue. But this bill must go forward even at this late hour.

It is clear that we have lost any semblance of control over who may enter our country. The Immigration Service projects that we will exceed last year's record 1.2 million apprehensions by a factor of 40. Compared to 1960, the apprehensions on our Southwest border therefore have doubled. The time to act is clearly now.

In October 1984, we went to conference on this bill for some 10 days. At that time, there were three issues on which that conference floundered. One was the question of a cap, and that has been resolved in a meeting with the President. The money will be there.

The next was the Frank special anti-discrimination provisions, and they have been modified and are now satisfactory.

The third was the question of agricultural labor and that remains with us today.

With respect to the forthcoming conference, I am far more optimistic than some of the speakers that we have heard.

I promise this body that this Member, who will be a conferee, committed as I am to immigration reform, will not sign a conference report that does not make major changes in the agricultural labor provisions of the measure before us.

Mr. Speaker, the risks of not going forward are too great. An immigration bill has been pending before the Congress in some form for the past several years. The Senate in three successive Congresses has passed comprehensive immigration reform. If we fail to enact reform in this Congress, I fear that when the day comes that a later Congress considers immigration reform, it will produce a bill that is narrow and restrictive. It will be driven toward passage by what will then be the pent-up frustration of the American people. This is too large a risk for me to accept.

I ask you to support the rule and go forward with this bill.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can consider the Lungren amendment and a motion to recommit with instructions.

I think it is unbelievable that after only 60 days of work in agriculture, this bill would put illegal aliens on the road to citizenship.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today the House is faced with another unacceptable choice. Unless we vote for an outrageous rule, we cannot even work on the immigration bill.

Two years ago, I voted for the immigration bill, even though I thought it was terrible, because reform was needed. Then, too, the House was presented with the complex bill in the last week of the session.

We might have expected that the House would have learned something in the past 2 years. No such luck. Here we go again. In what is supposed to be the second to last of the session, the House leadership wants to take up a controversial, complex bill with hundreds of amendments pending.

The rule made 23 amendments a part of the bill with no debate or no vote. It made another several dozen in order for debate. It rejected even more. The procedure was irrational. Therefore on the procedural questions, the previous question and the rule, itself, I shall cast a vote against the procedure.

We should have worked on this bill a year and a half ago. If we must work on it now, we need a relatively open rule.

The choice is with the House leadership. It can work on, and pass, an immigration bill. Or, it can kill the bill, by attacking the burden of this unacceptable procedure.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 559, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3810, immigration reform legislation.

Many things have been said this morning regarding both the rule and H.R. 3810, and much of what has been said unfairly characterizes the rule and the immigration reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3810 is a product of many months of debate and compromise in concepts and actual legislative language. The rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3810 furthermore provides adequate opportunity for all Members of this body to offer their own amendments and revisit many of the issues which some Members might consider objectionable. I suggest that we support the rule and move on the larger issue of discussing H.R. 3810.

With regard to H.R. 3810, Members of this body have risen to speak out against the so-called Schumer-Berman-Panetta agricultural provisions which are a part of the package. The compromise worked out by our colleagues is a good one and should be supported as is.

As the product of a typical 40-acre grape vineyard in the heart of California's San Joaquin Valley, I am fully aware of the need for an adequate labor supply to meet the often unexpected labor needs of the Valley's hundreds of small specialty crop farms. I am also fully aware of the difficulties which these farm

operations face in securing that work force when harvest demands dictate. And finally, I am fully aware and appreciative of the important contributions which those who volunteer to work in the harvests make to California agriculture and the dozens of communities whose economies are so intertwined with agriculture.

The compromise reflected in the Schumer-Berman-Panetta provision meets the needs of both agriculture and those who so choose agricultural work as a vocation. There is great balance and equity in the compromise package and Members of the House should recognize the importance of the compromise provisions to H.R. 3810.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and allow for the consideration of H.R. 3810.

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support for this rule. I support this rule for an imperfect bill because I am committed to do something about our immigration policy. The rule makes in order important amendments, such as the Garcia amendment, which will check the negative aspect of employer sanctions. It is an imperfect bill which has provisions which have no relevance to controlling our borders such as the special interest provisions for agricultural growers. Not many of my colleagues have focused during this debate on controlling the borders but rather on the agricultural guest-worker provision. My vote for the rule today is to give enlightened immigration reform a chance; however, I fear that the effort is threatened by special interests who would turn this bill into a foreign worker jobs bill. I urge my colleagues to give true immigration reform a chance and vote for this rule.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule for H.R. 3810, the immigration reform bill. Many Members have legitimate concerns about many provisions in this bill, but without approval of this rule, we may not be able to pass an immigration bill at all. We may repeat the tragedy of 1984, when, after having worked so hard for so long, we failed in the 11th hour to pass much needed immigration reform legislation. Let's not go down that path again.

The Schumer-Berman-Panetta compromise provision on agricultural workers is fragile in the extreme. It has taken 10 months to reach, and I believe it does a better job of balancing the need for a sufficient agricultural work force and our desire to protect those workers from exploitation than any other alternative before us. As with any compromise, no party achieved everything they sought. But the fact that growers' associations, labor unions, and civil liberties groups have joined in support of the provision is evidence to me that our colleagues have done a miraculously good job. We should not cut them off at the knees now.

Those of you concerned about the employer sanctions and amnesty provisions of this bill will have the opportunity to modify and vote on those sections. The rule before us does not prohibit your concerns from being heard. But there can be little doubt that amending the agricultural workers provision will be the bill's undoing, and may lead us back to the stalemate we experienced during the last Congress.

Those of you who support efforts to adopt the Senate's agricultural workers provision bill have a strong voice in the conference committee on this bill. But if you express your views by voting against this rule, there may not be a conference committee. We will all lose if no immigration bill is approved at all.

Support the rule on H.R. 3810, the immigration reform bill of 1986.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names.

[Roll No. 418]

Abercrombie	Crane	Hamilton
Ackerman	Daniel	Hammerschmidt
Akaka	Dannemeyer	Hansen
Alexander	Darden	Hatcher
Anderson	Daschle	Hawkins
Andrews	Daub	Hayes
Anthony	Davis	Hefner
Applegate	de la Garza	Hendon
Archer	DeLay	Henry
Arney	Dellums	Hertel
Aspin	DeWine	Hiler
Atkins	Dickinson	Hillis
AuCoin	Dicks	Holt
Badham	DioGuardi	Hopkins
Barnard	Dixon	Horton
Bartlett	Donnelly	Howard
Barton	Dorgan (ND)	Hoyer
Bateman	Dorman (CA)	Hubbard
Bates	Dowdy	Hughes
Bedell	Downey	Hunter
Beilenson	Dreier	Hutto
Bennett	Duncan	Hyde
Bentley	Durbin	Jacobs
Bereuter	Dwyer	Jeffords
Berman	Dymally	Jenkins
Bevill	Dyson	Johnson
Billrakis	Early	Jones (NC)
Bliley	Eckart (OH)	Jones (TN)
Boehlert	Eckert (NY)	Kanjorski
Boland	Emerson	Kaptur
Boner (TN)	English	Kasich
Bonior (MI)	Erdreich	Kastenmeier
Bonker	Evans (IA)	Kemp
Borski	Evans (IL)	Kennelly
Bosco	Fascell	Kildee
Boucher	Fawell	Kleczka
Boulter	Fazio	Kolbe
Boxer	Feighan	Kolter
Brooks	Fiedler	Kostmayer
Broomfield	Fields	LaFalce
Brown (CA)	Fish	Lagomarsino
Brown (CO)	Flippo	Latta
Bruce	Florio	Leach (IA)
Bryant	Foglietta	Leath (TX)
Burton (IN)	Foley	Lehman (CA)
Bustamante	Ford (MI)	Lehman (FL)
Byron	Ford (TN)	Leland
Callahan	Franklin	Lent
Carney	Frenzel	Levin (MI)
Carper	Frost	Levine (CA)
Carr	Fuqua	Lewis (CA)
Chandler	Gallo	Lewis (FL)
Chapman	Garcia	Lightfoot
Cheney	Gaydos	Lipinski
Clay	Gedjenson	Livingston
Clinger	Gekas	Lloyd
Coats	Gilman	Loeffler
Cobey	Glickman	Long
Coble	Gonzalez	Lott
Coelho	Goodling	Lowery (CA)
Coleman (MO)	Gordon	Lowry (WA)
Coleman (TX)	Gradison	Lujan
Collins	Gray (IL)	Luken
Combest	Gray (PA)	Lungren
Conte	Green	Mack
Conyers	Guarini	MacKay
Cooper	Gunderson	Madigan
Courter	Hall (OH)	Manton
Coyne	Hall, Ralph	Markey

Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Panetta
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell

Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skeltton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
(OR)
Smith, Robert
(NH)
Smith, Robert
(OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarez
Solomon

Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Stagers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Strang
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tausin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traffant
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldon
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Weaver
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whittaker
Whitten
Wilson
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wright
Wyden
Wyle
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 376 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

□ 1130

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3810, IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND LEGALIZATION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this rule, and this bill, is seriously flawed. We have one of the most important issues facing the country today, immigration reform, and it is brought to the floor with less than a week left before our scheduled adjournment date, under

a rule that automatically adapts 23 amendments, without debate, that have not even been made publically available to the general membership of the Congress. Many of these 23 amendments are very controversial. One for instance, apparently prohibits us from deporting Salvadorans and Nicaraguans who have come into the United States illegally. Another addresses the subject of Medicaid benefits for illegal aliens. Many U.S. citizens, myself included, happen to believe that only U.S. citizens should be eligible for such benefits, except in the most serious life-threatening emergency situations.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on indefinitely about the shortcomings of the rule, the legislation itself, and the procedure by which it has been brought to the floor. In the interests of time, I will not. Suffice it to say, the shortcomings of this package are so great that I plan to vote no on the rule, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, I joined several of my distinguished colleagues in a letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee requesting that he allow our esteemed colleague from California, DAN LUNGREN, an opportunity to amend the seasonal agricultural worker program provision in H.R. 3810. My colleague even testified before the Rules Committee seeking the opportunity to amend this program on the House floor. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee denied this request. We must now deny them their rule.

What is it about this so-called Schumer agricultural proposal that affords it such protection from deliberation by the full House? In my Education and Labor Committee, H.R. 3810 was considered without thorough review. We were told that any effort to alter the Schumer proposal would essentially gut any effort by the House to consider H.R. 3810 this session. Accordingly, the bill sailed through committee.

I can only conclude that this program is being protected by the Rules Committee because it could not survive an up or down vote or any other alteration here on the House floor. If this is the case, I would rather have no immigration bill this Congress than to see us pass one laden with this ill-conceived, give-away program. Thus, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we may have the opportunity to amend the Schumer proposal.

There are many bad provisions in H.R. 3810, and we will later get the opportunity to vote on them, but none is more offensive than this seasonal agricultural worker program. This provision gives permanent resident status to illegal aliens who worked in agriculture for at least 60 days between May 1, 1985, and May 1, 1986. These workers would be eligible immediately for entitlement benefits, such as food stamps, AFDC, Medicaid, SSI, and unemployment compensation.

This program should be stripped from H.R. 3810 for two reasons. First, it provides a separate legalization track for a selected group of illegal aliens. Whereas aliens not in agriculture must prove their presence in the United States since 1982 to obtain temporary resi-

dent status, these agricultural workers only have to have worked in agriculture for 60 days to obtain permanent resident status. Thus, agricultural workers will be eligible for Federal benefits immediately; all others will have to wait 5 years.

Second, the Schumer proposal undercuts the implementation of an effective and sound immigration policy. Because aliens working in agriculture can qualify immediately for permanent resident status, they may bring their immediate family into the country and all qualify for Federal benefits.

The bill further lures illegal aliens to this country with its replenishment worker program. These agricultural workers, allowed entry to meet unforeseen shortages, could become permanent residents after 1 year. Although such workers would not be eligible for 5 years for most Federal benefits, other program benefits would remain available to them, such as food stamps, Legal Services Corporation assistance, and some types of housing aid. Upon attaining permanent resident status, these replenishment workers could now bring their immediate families to the United States and qualify for Federal benefits.

If we defeat the previous question, Mr. LUNGREN will be permitted to offer a substitute amendment to the Schumer proposal. Essentially, the Lungren amendment would strike the Schumer proposal and insert the Senate-passed immigration bill's seasonal worker program.

Although I have some problems with this so-called Wilson proposal, it has many lucrative features. It does not allow more than 350,000 foreign workers into the country at any one time, does not allow workers to stay in the United States more than 9 months out of the year, provides a monetary incentive for workers to return to their native countries, denies Federal welfare benefits to foreign workers, and expires at the end of 3 years unless Congress votes to extend the program.

The Schumer proposal is not the solution to the agricultural industry's concerns or the solution to our immigration problems. It is only the beginning of bigger immigration problems for our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support the motion to defeat the previous question.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and just want to indicate how sad I believe this day is.

I have heard Member after Member take the well and talk about how reluctantly they were going to have to support a rule that they really did not believe in. It seems to me that what we ought to do is allow the majority of this House to express its will. I believe we ought to go with the majority.

If you have the belief in your convictions you will also let the majority decide. Vote no on the previous question.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, some Members probably wonder why I would be asking them to vote no on

the previous question and vote against the rule since they know for the last 8 years I have been on this floor on a weekly, daily, monthly basis urging us to get on with the responsibility of dealing with immigration reform.

I think Members ought to know what they are voting on today on this rule before they vote. You ought to know that there are 23 substantive amendments to the bill that are adopted automatically when you adopt the rule. You ought to know that extended voluntary departure, that is granting permanent residence status, that is what it amounts to, to every Salvadoran and every Nicaraguan who came into this country illegally before November of last year is what you adopt by adopting the rule.

No debate is allowed, no amendments are allowed. If you want to talk about super, super, super amnesty, that is it.

If you really want to talk about super, super amnesty, talk about the Schumer amendment. The Schumer amendment says if you work for 60 days in agriculture between May 1, 1985 and May 1, 1986, you have got a green card, May 1 of 1985 to May 1 of 1986, just work 60 days in agriculture and you have a green card.

What is a green card? That allows you to be here permanently in the United States. In 5 years, you are a citizen. You have a right to apply for citizenship, and immediately you can petition to bring your family in.

How many people? We have heard 250,000, maybe 350,000. Multiply that by the number of family members that are going to be brought in, and you are voting for a super, super amnesty.

I have worked on my side of the aisle for the acceptance of the idea that we need some legalization. But I have always said that legalization has to be one time only, it ought to be based on long time commitment of people to the United States. That is, it is humane for those people who have long time commitments to the United States, who lived here to become members of our community. It ought to require them additional obligations so that there is some recognition that what we have done in the past is wrong, and it ought not to give the signal in the future that we are going to have another legalization or amnesty program.

The Schumer amendment fails all of those things. Do you think 60 days in this country is sufficient reason to give citizenship? Do you think that the fact that you can replenish the group for 12 years suggests that somehow we are not going to have a repeat of this in the future? Do you think that the fact that the replenishment group is given preference to those who have been here illegally after the

group originally comes in, so in other words, don't go home, stay here illegally because you have another chance to get here.

I ask you: Is that what we are talking about in terms of legalization? We could debate it on the floor.

Two years ago we adopted the Panetta-Morrison amendment which was the approach the House thought by a 53-vote margin ought to be the way to help agriculture. That is what I have tried to do with the Lungren amendment. I was told in the Rules Committee I would not be allowed the amendment because they knew I would prevail on the floor, because they knew a majority of the House Members would support that. Instead, by voting this rule, you are not allowed to do that.

People arguing for the rule have said we fenced off the question of agriculture. We have not fenced it off. We have given citizenship rights to anybody who is here for 60 days and worked one man day each of those.

What kind of nonsense are we talking about? Do you not think you have a right to go home to your constituents and say no, I did not think we ought to grant citizenship rights to people who have only been here 60 days? What are you going to say when someone walks in the door and says, I have been here from the Philippines illegally for 2 years, or I have been here from Mexico for 2 years, but I cannot become a citizen.

I ask you please, please give yourself a chance to vote on these serious questions. Vote down the previous question so we can be allowed to do that.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes, for purposes of debate only, to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODINO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will just take a few seconds of the time.

It grieves me very much not to be on the same side of this issue as my friend from California, with whom I have worked 6 years very closely on this issue. I do hope that the House votes up the previous question and votes up the rule.

I was the only Democrat in our panel to oppose the Schumer amendment, and if it had come to us today in the form in which it was passed by the Judiciary Committee I would have joined my friend in his opposition.

The Rules Committee has made in this bill five amendments which I placed to the Schumer bill correcting five of its most egregious flaws. Further correction will occur because of the Ways and Means Committee amendments in this bill, and I hope further correction will occur in the conference.

I ask the House to let the committee work its will, vote up the previous question, and vote up the rule.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the House that 15 years ago when the undocumented alien problem first came to the scene I, as then chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, stressed the need for remedial legislation and I came up with the concept of employer sanctions to remove the magnet-jobs drawing aliens to this country.

At that time, there were some 300,000 aliens apprehended attempting to illegally enter this country to find a job. Today there are 2 million illegals being apprehended yearly. If we intend to do anything to bring about reform, we must enact sanctions. We must adopt a legalization program which will bring undocumented aliens with equities and family here out of the shadows and thereby remove their vulnerable and exploitable status.

□ 1140

The Rules Committee fashioned a fair and balanced rule that will allow this to happen. There were so many amendments sought to be offered, that all could not be made in order. Some amendments I would have liked to debate were not made in order. Others were made in order that I would have preferred not to debate.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] has three amendments that have been made in order which were offered in committee and defeated soundly. I would like to point out that the very amendment that he wants to offer now, which he complains about not having been made in order is one that would provide for a guest-worker program. Such an amendment, I assure you, will kill the bill.

I, for one, will withdraw my support and do everything possible to ensure that we do not have any bill with a guest-worker program. The reason why we failed in the last session to reach a conference compromise was for the reason that we were unable to resolve the impasse that had developed on the agricultural question even though it involves only 10 percent to 15 percent of the total undocumented alien problem. The Schumer-Berman-Panetta compromise has apparently accomplished this and satisfied both the growers and farm labor.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I urge my colleagues to support the rule. A vote against it is a vote against immigration reform. A vote against it is a

vote to preserve the status quo of open borders and of massive exploitation of millions of undocumented aliens in this country.

To defeat the rule is to bring about the demise of immigration reform legislation for this Congress. We cannot let that happen. To defeat the rule is to simply put our heads in the sand and allow a pressing problem to become an overwhelming problem.

The American public is demanding action now and I hope this Congress does not let them down.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the questions that were raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] have been debated back and forth for the past hour almost. I am sorry that more Members were not here to hear the debate.

The rule in effect does say,

Don't let the farmworker problem, which has been solved in this legislation in a manner acceptable by all of the interests intimately concerned with it: The growers, the laborers, the farmworkers themselves; don't let this limited issue destroy our chances of getting real immigration reform. Let's fence off and protect for the moment the agreement that has been reached about what to do exactly about the 200,000 to 300,000 persons who are needed each year to harvest these crops, so that we may solve the basic and much larger problem of ensuring that the between 1 and 2 million illegals who come in each year will no longer be able to do so.

As every speaker has mentioned, this is a most important bill. We should move ahead and consider it. We have the right and we should have the duty to control our borders, our continuing failure to do so breeds an immense amount of disrespect for the law. The current law is inconsistent and indefensible. It is unlawful for someone who is here illegally to work, but it is not unlawful for an employer to hire someone whom he knows is here illegally for work.

Perhaps most importantly the large-scale illegal immigration of people into the United States has led to the development and rapid growth in this country of a subculture, of a second class of persons who are without rights or protection under our laws, and are preyed upon by landlords, employers, and criminals.

Finally, it is unfair to those who are waiting patiently to come into this country legally, for us to continue to turn our backs on the huge number of persons who are pouring over our borders illegally.

Let us pass this rule and get on with the business of confronting in a serious and determined way this most serious and pressing domestic issue.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 189, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—196

Abercrombie	Frank	Oberstar
Ackerman	Frost	Obey
Akaka	Fuqua	Olin
Alexander	Garcia	Ortiz
Annunzio	Gaydos	Owens
Anthony	Gejdenson	Packard
Aspin	Gilman	Panetta
Atkins	Glickman	Pashayan
AuCoin	Gordon	Pease
Barnard	Gray (IL)	Penny
Barnes	Gray (PA)	Pepper
Bates	Green	Perkins
Bedell	Guarini	Price
Bellenson	Hall (OH)	Rahall
Bennett	Hamilton	Rangel
Berman	Hatcher	Reid
Boland	Hawkins	Richardson
Boner (TN)	Hayes	Rodino
Bonior (MI)	Hefner	Roemer
Bonker	Hertel	Rose
Borski	Howard	Rostenkowski
Bosco	Hoyer	Rowland (GA)
Boucher	Jenkins	Roybal
Boxer	Jones (NC)	Russo
Brown (CA)	Jones (TN)	Sabo
Bruce	Kanjorski	Schumer
Bryant	Kaptur	Seiberling
Bustamante	Kastenmeier	Sharp
Carper	Kennelly	Sikorski
Carr	Kildee	Sisisky
Clay	Kostmayer	Skelton
Coelho	LaFalce	Slattery
Coleman (TX)	Leath (TX)	Smith (FL)
Collins	Lehman (CA)	Smith (IA)
Conyers	Lehman (FL)	Smith, Robert
Cooper	Leland	(OR)
Coyne	Levin (MI)	Solarz
Daniel	Levine (CA)	Spratt
Darden	Lipinski	St Germain
Daschle	Long	Stallings
de la Garza	Lowry (WA)	Stark
Dellums	Luken	Stratton
Dicks	MacKay	Studds
Dixon	Manton	Swift
Donnelly	Markey	Synar
Dorgan (ND)	Matsui	Tallon
Downey	Mavroules	Thomas (GA)
Dreier	Mazzoli	Torres
Durbin	McCloskey	Towns
Dwyer	McCurdy	Trafigant
Dymally	McHugh	Udall
Dyson	McKinney	Valentine
Early	Mica	Vento
Eckart (OH)	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Edwards (CA)	Mineta	Waldon
Evans (IA)	Moakley	Walgren
Evans (IL)	Mollohan	Weaver
Fascell	Moody	Weiss
Fazio	Morrison (CT)	Wheat
Feighan	Morrison (WA)	Whitten
Fish	Mrazek	Wise
Florio	Murtha	Wright
Foglietta	Natcher	Wyden
Foley	Nelson	Yates
Ford (MI)	Nowak	Young (MO)
Ford (TN)	Oakar	

NOES—189

Barton	Boehlert
Andrews	Boggs
Applegate	Boulter
Archer	Brooks
Arney	Broomfield
Badham	Brown (CO)
Bartlett	Burton (IN)

Byron	Johnson	Roth
Callahan	Kasich	Roukema
Carney	Kemp	Rowland (CT)
Chandler	Kleczka	Rudd
Chapman	Kolbe	Saxton
Cheney	Kolter	Schaefer
Clinger	Lagomarsino	Scheuer
Coats	Leach (IA)	Schroeder
Cobey	Lent	Schuetz
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Schulze
Coleman (MO)	Lewis (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Combest	Lightfoot	Shaw
Conte	Livingston	Shelby
Coughlin	Lloyd	Shumway
Courter	Loeffler	Shuster
Crane	Lott	Siljander
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Skeen
Daub	Lujan	Slaughter
Davis	Lungren	Smith (NE)
DeLay	Mack	Smith (NJ)
DeWine	Madigan	Smith, Denny
Dickinson	Marlenee	(OR)
DioGuardi	Martin (IL)	Smith, Robert
Dornan (CA)	Martin (NY)	(NH)
Dowdy	McCain	Snowe
Duncan	McCandless	Snyder
Eckert (NY)	McCollum	Solomon
Emerson	McEwen	Spence
English	McGrath	Staggers
Erdreich	McKernan	Stangeland
Fawell	McMillan	Stenholm
Fiedler	Meyers	Strang
Fields	Michel	Stump
Flippo	Miller (OH)	Sundquist
Franklin	Miller (WA)	Sweeney
Frenzel	Molinari	Swindall
Gallo	Montgomery	Tauke
Gekas	Moorhead	Tauzin
Gingrich	Murphy	Taylor
Gonzalez	Myers	Thomas (CA)
Goodling	Neal	Torricelli
Gradison	Nichols	Vander Jagt
Gunderson	Nielson	Volkmer
Hall, Ralph	Oxley	Vucanovich
Hendon	Petri	Walker
Henry	Pickle	Watkins
Hiler	Porter	Weber
Holt	Purcell	Whitehurst
Hopkins	Quillen	Whittaker
Horton	Ray	Wilson
Hubbard	Ridge	Wirth
Hunter	Rinaldo	Wolf
Hutto	Ritter	Wylie
Hyde	Roberts	Yatron
Ireland	Robinson	Young (AK)
Jacobs	Roe	Young (FL)
Jeffords	Rogers	

NOT VOTING—47

Biaggi	Grotberg	Mitchell
Breaux	Hammerschmidt	Monson
Burton (CA)	Hansen	Moore
Campbell	Hartnett	Parris
Chappell	Hillis	Regula
Chapple	Huckaby	Savage
Craig	Hughes	Schneider
Crockett	Jones (OK)	Stokes
Derrick	Kindness	Traxler
Dingell	Kramer	Waxman
Edgar	Lantos	Whitley
Edwards (OK)	Latta	Williams
Fowler	Lundine	Wolpe
Gephardt	Martinez	Wortley
Gibbons	McDade	Zschau
Gregg	Mikulski	

□ 1150

Mr. TRAFICANT changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 202, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—180

Abercrombie	Frank	Oberstar
Ackerman	Fuqua	Obey
Akaka	Garcia	Olin
Annunzio	Gejdenson	Ortiz
Anthony	Gilman	Owens
Aspin	Glickman	Packard
Atkins	Gordon	Panetta
AuCoin	Gray (IL)	Pashayan
Barnes	Gray (PA)	Penny
Bates	Green	Pepper
Bedell	Guarini	Perkins
Bellenson	Hall (OH)	Price
Bennett	Hamilton	Quillen
Berman	Hatcher	Rahall
Boggs	Hawkins	Rangel
Boland	Hayes	Reid
Bonior (MI)	Hertel	Richardson
Bonker	Howard	Rodino
Borski	Hoyer	Roemer
Bosco	Hutto	Rose
Boucher	Jones (NC)	Rostenkowski
Boxer	Jones (TN)	Sabo
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Schroeder
Bruce	Kastenmeier	Schumer
Bryant	Kennelly	Seiberling
Bustamante	Kildee	Sharp
Carper	Kostmayer	Sikorski
Chandler	LaFalce	Sisisky
Clay	Leath (TX)	Skelton
Coelho	Lehman (CA)	Slattery
Coleman (TX)	Lehman (FL)	Smith (FL)
Collins	Leland	Smith, Robert
Conyers	Levin (MI)	(OR)
Cooper	Levine (CA)	Solarz
Coyne	Long	Spratt
Daniel	Lowry (WA)	St Germain
Darden	Luken	Staggers
Daschle	MacKay	Stallings
de la Garza	Manton	Stark
Dellums	Markley	Stratton
Dicks	Mollohan	Studds
Dixon	Moody	Swift
Donnelly	Morrison (CT)	Weiss
Dorgan (ND)	Morrison (WA)	Wheat
Downey	Mrazek	Wise
Dreier	Murtha	Wright
Durbin	Natcher	Wyden
Dwyer	Nelson	Yates
Dymally	Nielson	Young (MO)
Dyson	Nowak	
Early	Oakar	
Eckart (OH)		
Edwards (CA)		
Evans (IA)		
Evans (IL)		
Fascell		
Fazio		
Feighan		
Fish		
Florio		
Foglietta		
Foley		
Ford (MI)		
Ford (TN)		

NOES—202

Anderson	Brown (CO)	Davis
Andrews	Burton (IN)	DeLay
Applegate	Byron	DeWine
Archer	Callahan	Dickinson
Arney	Carney	Dornan (CA)
Badham	Carr	Dowdy
Barnard	Chapman	Dreier
Bartlett	Cheney	Duncan
Barton	Clinger	Eckert (NY)
Bateman	Coats	Emerson
Bentley	Cobey	English
Bereuter	Coble	Erdreich
Bevill	Coleman (MO)	Evans (IA)
Bilirakis	Combest	Fawell
Bliley	Coughlin	Fiedler
Boehlert	Courter	Fields
Boner (TN)	Crane	Flippo
Boulter	Dannemeyer	Ford (TN)
Brooks	Darden	Franklin
Broomfield	Daub	Frenzel

Frost	Marlenee	Shelby
Gallo	Martin (IL)	Shumway
Gaydos	Martin (NY)	Shuster
Gekas	McCain	Siljander
Gingrich	McCandless	Skeen
Gonzalez	McCollum	Slaughter
Goodling	McEwen	Smith (IA)
Gradison	McGrath	Smith (NE)
Gunderson	McKernan	Smith (NJ)
Hall, Ralph	McMillan	Smith, Denny
Hefner	Meyers	(OR)
Hendon	Mica	Smith, Robert
Henry	Michel	(NH)
Hiler	Miller (OH)	Snowe
Holt	Miller (WA)	Snyder
Hopkins	Molinari	Solomon
Horton	Montgomery	Spence
Hubbard	Moorhead	Stangeland
Hughes	Murphy	Stenholm
Hunter	Myers	Strang
Hyde	Neal	Stump
Ireland	Nichols	Sundquist
Jacobs	Oxley	Sweeney
Jeffords	Pease	Swindall
Jenkins	Petri	Tallon
Johnson	Pickle	Tauke
Kanjorski	Porter	Tauzin
Kasich	Pursell	Taylor
Kemp	Ray	Thomas (CA)
Klecza	Ridge	Torricelli
Kolbe	Rinaldo	Trafiacant
Kolter	Ritter	Valentine
Lagomarsino	Robinson	Vander Jagt
Leach (IA)	Roe	Vucanovich
Lent	Rogers	Walgren
Lewis (CA)	Roth	Walker
Lewis (FL)	Roukema	Watkins
Lightfoot	Rowland (CT)	Weber
Lipinski	Rowland (GA)	Whitehurst
Livingston	Roybal	Whittaker
Lloyd	Rudd	Whitten
Loeffler	Saxton	Wilson
Lott	Schaefer	Wirth
Lowery (CA)	Scheuer	Wolf
Lujan	Schuetz	Wylie
Lungren	Schulze	Yatron
Mack	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Madigan	Shaw	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—50

Alexander	Gregg	Monson
Biaggi	Groberg	Moore
Breaux	Hammerschmidt	Parris
Burton (CA)	Hansen	Regula
Campbell	Hartnett	Roberts
Chappell	Hillis	Russo
Chappie	Huckaby	Savage
Craig	Jones (OK)	Schneider
Crockett	Kindness	Stokes
de la Garza	Kramer	Traxler
Derrick	Lantos	Waxman
Dorgan (ND)	Latta	Whitley
Edgar	Lundine	Williams
Edwards (OK)	Martinez	Wolpe
Fowler	McDade	Wortley
Gephardt	Mikulski	Zschau
Gibbons	Mitchell	

□ 1215

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Kramer against.
Mr. Martinez for, with Mr. Wortley against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Parris against.
Mr. Wolpe for, with Mr. Kindness against.
Mr. Waxman for, with Mr. Craig against.

So the resolution was not agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the Committee on Armed Services:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 24, 1986.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of House Armed Services Committee, and ask that my resignation become effective as of the close of business September 26, 1986.

Sincerely,

ELWOOD H. "BUD" HILLIS,
Member of Congress.

ELECTION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 565) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 565

Resolved, That Representative James V. Hansen, of Utah, be and is hereby elected to the Committee on Armed Services.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. LOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished majority leader for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for next week.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the program for today has been somewhat subsumed. We will have 1-minute speeches. Then, there is no further business scheduled for today.

We expect on Monday to meet at 12 noon and to take up approximately 16 bills under suspension of the rules. The 16 suspensions are as follows:

H.R. 5490, retiree benefits under labor contracts;

H.R. 5558, administrative naturalization bill;

H.R. 5541, private debt collection;

H.R. 5362, Supreme Court police;

H.R. 5390, Arkansas-Mississippi Great River Bridge Compact;

H.R. 4823, INS (Immigration-Naturalization Service) efficiency bill;

H.R. 4444, consular efficiency bill;

H.R. 5559, Immigration and Naturalization Service bill;

H.R. 4059, Red River Valley Fighter Pilots Charter;

H.R. 5363, Declaration of Taking Act amendments;

H.R. 3737, Immigration-Naturalization Act amendments re marriage fraud;

H.R. 5560, child pornography;

H.R. 5576, domestic banking stability and housing bill;

H.R. 5564, Housing Act amendments;

H.R. 5554, Community Development Credit Union Loan Fund; and

H.R. 4917, Depository Institution Examination Improvement Act of 1986.

On Tuesday, we have an additional number of suspensions, and there may be as many as 25 on that day. Those suspensions are as follows:

H.R. 5595, SSI improvement amendments of 1986;

H. Res. 556, chocolate tariff bill;

H. Con. Res. 332, concerning Soviet Union's persecution of Helsinki monitoring;

S. Con. Res. 143, sense of Congress re resumption of U.N. Commissioner for Vietnam Refugees' Orderly Departure;

H. Res. 437, Presidential Summit Against International Terrorism;

H. Con. Res. 384, sense of Congress re Soviet Union interference with postal communications;

H. Con. Res. 391, calling on Soviet Union to cease interference with Voice of America;

H.R. 4712, Klamath River Basin;

H.J. Res. 626, Palau Compact;

H.R. 5508, Sipsey Scenic River and Wilderness in Alabama;

H.R. 5496, Georgia Wilderness;

H.R. 5332, Haida land exchange in Alaska;

H.R. 5459, Secretary of the Interior's authority re Utah land;

H.R. 5389, Alaska public lands;

H.J. Res. 699, uranium enrichment bill;

H.R. 5192, NRC Emergency Response Program;

H.R. 3352, Property transfer to Mesquites in Nevada;

S. 565, Arizona land conveyance;

H.R. 2868, land claims of Wampanoag Indians of Gay Head, MA;

H.R. 5390, Arkansas-Mississippi Great River Bridge Compact;

H.R. 4961, National Transportation Safety Board amendments;

H.R. 5488, amend FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency);

H.R. 5020, additional White House protection;

H.R. 5568, Truck Safety Program; and

S. 1124, deregulate freight forwarding industry.

Members really need to expect some further action on the continuing resolution, on the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, and on the Debt Limit Extension. Those are the three remaining necessary actions which the Congress must complete prior to being able to adjourn sine die.

We hope those will come and be resolved next week. In addition to that, there may be other conference reports that would arise.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for that information. Let me ask a couple of questions to make sure the membership understands.

The business for the day then is completed, in view of the vote, except for the 1-minute speeches; is that correct? And, of course, special orders?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is correct. We have no business scheduled at this time, save for the 1-minute speeches and special orders.

Mr. LOTT. On Monday, the House will come in at 12 and will take up this list of suspensions. Does the gentleman anticipate votes on Monday?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes. Undoubtedly, there will be some votes on Monday. These suspensions will be debated and then, at the conclusion of the debate, votes will be taken Monday on any suspensions on which votes have been requested.

Then it is possible, as the gentleman knows, that we might have a further vote on a matter of some importance, which I would not want to anticipate, nor prejudge the action of the Chief Executive of the Nation.

Mr. LOTT. Yes, sir. I think the information we have received in communicating with the leadership on your side of the aisle is that the votes probably would not occur before around 3 o'clock or thereafter on Monday; is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is absolutely right. It seems plausible that debates on this many suspensions would take us from noon until at least 3 o'clock so that Members be advised that they reasonably could expect votes not to occur prior to that time. Also, they should be advised that there will be some votes on Monday.

Mr. LOTT. All right, sir. Now, the gentleman says that there are a number of suspensions anticipated on Tuesday?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOTT. Some 25 are listed on the tentative schedule.

Mr. WRIGHT. There is a tentative schedule list of 25 for Tuesday in addition to the 16 scheduled for Monday.

Mr. LOTT. Would the majority leader anticipate a request for additional suspensions on Wednesday?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is altogether possible. I do not know that it will be requisite if we complete these. This may clean it up, but as the gentleman knows, there always are possibilities that a committee may bring up additional bills and demand their consideration.

Mr. LOTT. Is it anticipated that there will be an emergency meeting of the Rules Committee either later on today or possibly Monday with further reference to the rule for the immigration reform and legalization amendments?

Mr. WRIGHT. There is no plan to ask the Rules Committee to do any-

thing further today. As for Monday, I think the evil of the day will be sufficient to the day thereof—or whatever that famous quote is. Let us wait until Monday and discover what problems we have then.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman.

One final request: We are in what we hope will be the last hours of the session.

□ 1225

We will have a long list of suspensions, both on Monday and on Tuesday, and perhaps others, but we would like to ask that your leadership be sure to communicate with us and we understand what you are trying to bring up so that we can hopefully work together and support you in that effort.

I think if you would give us the benefit of that communication information, it would save us some time and maybe some difficulty.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the gentleman makes a good point and as always, we will try as best we can to work together and share what information we have to avoid any surprises.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, one final question: Does the gentleman anticipate any possibility that the Congress could finish this session sine die, as originally hoped, on Friday, October 3?

Mr. WRIGHT. There is always that possibility. Hope springs eternal. It may be more possible than likely, but it is possible. That remains our goal.

Mr. LOTT. Thank you for that clarification. That is about what we thought.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad I was able to give the gentleman that definitive answer.

Mr. LOTT. On Friday afternoon, we would be out of session, regardless, at sundown; is that correct?

Mr. WRIGHT. We will be out of session at sundown for the observance of the holy days of the Jewish faith. That does not anticipate a sine die adjournment if we have not completed our business. We would expect to be in session the following week.

Mr. LOTT. Whether it is sine die or just stopping in view of that observance, we will stop by sundown.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is exactly right. There is no expectation of our staying in session at a time that would conflict with the observance of the Jewish holiday. We would like to finish all of our work, if we can, by that time.

If we cannot, if it is not possible, then we would expect to be in session the following week.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader and yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I know, as you stated, that we should not anticipate any action by the Chief Executive. However, a possibility does exist that some action might be taken on the part of the Chief Executive which would give us some additional considerations to take care of on Monday or immediately thereafter.

If that action does take place and this body is then called upon to take any further action, would that action take place certainly on Monday, or could that possibly be happening on Tuesday or Wednesday?

Mr. WRIGHT. If the President should veto the bill providing sanctions against South Africa, for example, and if that veto should be rendered this weekend, then we would expect to vote upon a motion to override the veto, not prior to, but following our action on the suspensions on Monday.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1986

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain 1-minute speeches.

NAKASONE COMMENT

(Mr. FORD of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, in a lecture to members of Japan's Liberal Democratic Party, Prime Minister Nakasone was quoted by several newspaper sources as saying that the intelligence level in the United States was low due to the numbers of blacks, Puerto Ricans, and Mexicans residing here.

I am totally amazed that this arrogant type of comment could emanate from a Japanese head of state.

As a Member of the U.S. Congress, I am insulted by such a statement.

Yet, as an Afro-American, Mr. Speaker, I feel outraged.

Mr. Nakasone is not smart enough to comprehend that our country is a melting pot, made great by the intelligence and hard work of the very people he ridicules.

If the Prime Minister really wanted to explain why the Japanese economy operates with such a trade surplus, he might properly point out that foreign products in Japan are not afforded the same open markets that Japanese products are here.

Instead of honorably apologizing, the Prime Minister continues to claim he was misquoted. Mr. Nakasone, perhaps the expression "quota restriction" might help to clear up your alleged misquote.

I'm sure the Japanese leader might take this matter more seriously if the Ways and Means Committee initiated market restrictions against Japanese products entering this country. Perhaps then an appropriate apology might be forthcoming.

FREE THE AMERICAN DRIVER

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every day, countless numbers of Americans break the law. Again and again they drive over 55 miles per hour on our Nation's roads. Sure, some surveys indicate people support keeping the 55-miles-per-hour speed limit but the truth of the matter is people are voting with their right foot. They press their gas pedals to speeds appropriate for the roads they drive.

The initial drop in fatality rates which occurred after the mandatory 55-miles per hour law of 1973 is misleading. Mr. Speaker, I remember not driving much in 1973 because the availability of gasoline was questionable. With the decline of drivers on the roads across our Nation during a period of gasoline shortages, it's obvious to me what the number of fatal accidents declined.

Texas has numerous rural roads designed for safe driving at 60- to 70-miles-per-hour speeds. On these roads, Texans are more prone to face driving fatalities induced by dangerous driving fatigue rather than fatalities from driving 65 miles per hour. More serious, they face fatality from the alarming number of drunken drivers on our roads. Patrol officers should be freed to enforce drunk driving laws rather than enforcing low speed limits.

An amendment which I recently cosponsored would have allowed States to increase their speed limits to 65 miles per hour on certain interstate routes in noncongested or rural areas. Although this amendment failed, I am encouraged that the narrow margin of defeat indicates a growing and widespread support for this approach. I submit a recent Dallas Morning News editorial on this issue for my colleagues review.

(From the Dallas Morning News, Aug. 26, 1986)

SPEED LIMITS: U.S. MAY END BLACKMAIL OF STATES FOR 55 MPH

The federal government a dozen years ago forced highway speed limits down from 70 to 55 by threatening to withhold federal highway aid from states that didn't go along.

President Reagan is said by two Western Senators, Steve Symms of Idaho and Chic Hecht of Nevada, to favor restoring the states' former privilege of determining the speeds that shall prevail on their highways.

Let's hope so. The 55-mile-an-hour speed limit is a relic of the early energy crisis, when the federal government, to address a problem caused largely by misguided economic policies, ordered the lowering of thermostats and the allocation of gasoline. The White House cut back Christmas tree lighting by 80 percent, and the governor of Delaware swapped his chauffeur-driven limousine for a chauffeur-driven Pinto.

The energy shortage is widely rumored to have ended three or four years ago, thanks to the laws of supply and demand, and to a more rational federal policy regarding same, but the 55-mile-an-hour limit endures, flouted and disregarded by an apparent majority of drivers. To the extent it is observed, Symms contends that it wastes a billion hours a year.

Safety advocates point out in rebuttal that the "double nickel" limit saves as many as 2,000 lives a year—no ignoble consideration. But the White House isn't talking of forcing the speed limit back to 70, where it stood prior to 1973.

Reagan's position, in a letter Symms and Hecht say was written Aug. 15, is that "governors will exercise with the greatest of care whatever level of control is ultimately returned to them." Interstate highways are engineered for driving at 70; smaller state roads may or may not be. Sixty (the speed limit that prevailed until the early 1960s) might be the most reasonable limit on such highways.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5568, COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT OF 1986

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation may have until 5 p.m. today, September 26, 1986, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 5568, the Commercial Vehicle Safety Act of 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I further state that this matter has been cleared by the minority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEILENSEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the gentleman's request and his statement that it has been cleared by the minority. Could the gentleman tell us who cleared that?

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAUB. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this has been cleared by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] and also the other members on the subcommittee. I also just cleared it with the gentleman's counsel on the minority side.

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE BIG LIE IN ACTION

(Mr. BONIOR of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today the President will veto sanctions against South Africa, whose violent policy of apartheid enslaves the majority of South Africa.

Yet at the same time, the President argues that the United States must overthrow the Government of Nicaragua in the name of human rights.

Black South Africans urge the United States to impose sanctions against apartheid, yet today the President will argue that sanctions are wrong because they hurt innocent blacks.

Yet at the same time, the President funds the Contra campaign of rape, torture, and murder against innocent civilians throughout Nicaragua.

Today, all Americans can see the big lie in action.

By years end, United States advisers will be in Honduras, and the Vietnam cycle of credibility gap and death will move one step further.

WHO DID YOU HURT BY SHOOTING YOURSELF IN THE FOOT, GOLIATH?

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the dollar is making new lows against the Japanese yen, right according to schedule, as set by the U.S. Treasury. Yet our trade imbalance is getting worse, not better. What went wrong?

The American Goliath shot himself in the foot at the start of the race against the Japanese David. The lame giant added insult to injury by bragging that he can win, in spite of his self-inflicted handicap, against his nimble opponent.

The bragging is misplaced. American exporters are not helped by the unstable and depreciating dollar, as promised by the false prophets of currency debasement; they are gravely injured by it. Conversely, Japanese exporters in defending their market share are not hindered by the stronger and more stable yen: They actually find it a source of strength. Any exporter, worthy of his salt, knows how to take advantage of his stronger domestic currency against the weaker currency of his competitor in order to cut his relative costs—an advantage denied to the American exporters by the U.S. Treasury.

The American export industry could make a comeback and compete successfully only if the value of the dollar was stabilized: only if Congress fixed the gold content of the dollar.

THE SCHUMER PROGRAM—A SECOND AMNESTY PROVISION

(Mr. McCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, we voted the right way to defeat an outrageous rule on the immigration reform bill. We voted down that rule because that was a gag rule that would have prevented us from addressing the really critical and controversial portion of that bill, which was a second amnesty provision called the Schumer program on agriculture.

□ 1235

We made a mistake, though, in not having the same majority Members vote down the previous question just prior to that vote. Had that occurred, we would have been able to get a rule right back out here with the opportunity to vote on that issue.

We need to control our borders. We need immigration reform.

This Member and many others have supported this in the past. We came that close in the last Congress.

I strongly urge my colleagues on the Rules Committee to go back into session now, either this afternoon or the first thing on Monday, and prepare a rule that is appropriate, that does not put up 23 amendments that we cannot vote on in the rule itself and allow an opportunity for other alternative proposals in the agricultural area to be offered, coming closer to what we had in the last Congress.

At the very least, let us have the opportunity to vote on the same agricultural provisions that we did in the last Congress.

Let us be fair about it. Let us not have gag rules out here. Let us proceed with immigration reform that is vitally needed by this Nation and let nobody be mistaken who is for it and who is against it. Those who would craft gag rules are against getting to immigration reform.

Let us get on with it and have a proper rule.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Mr. DAUB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I want to wholeheartedly concur with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM], a member of the Judiciary Committee, who preceded me in this well.

I want to indicate to my colleagues that while I have major differences with the content of the reported bill from the committee, my most emotionally difficult choice on the floor today was to support a motion to defeat the previous question and a motion to defeat the rule, because we do need to get our borders better under control. We do need to try to stem the tide of the chain migration that will affect us if amnesty is granted; but employer sanctions and how we deal with the question of identifying those who come here illegally are serious issues and they ought to be allowed full debate on the floor of this body.

The rule, had it passed, would have denied the most basic of the demerits of the content of the bill. They could not have been debated.

The vote was 167 Democrats and 13 Republicans for the rule, but 57 Democrats joining 145 Republicans voted to defeat this rule.

The Rules Committee should convene, should adopt a broader rule, a fairer rule, and bring this bill back to the floor of the House while we await action in the other body on the business we have already concluded. There will be at least 1 week or 2 to get the job done on immigration reform.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5546, NATIONAL VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file the report on H.R. 5546, the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAY of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

VETERANS FASTING FOR LIFE

(Mr. DYMALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of our rush to complete critical legislation, we seem to have ignored one very serious issue. There are four American war veterans who have committed their lives to open-ended fasts expressing their hope for an end of the war in Nicaragua.

Duncan Murphy, Brian Wilson, Charlie Liteky, and George Mizo are starving for peace right here in the Capitol.

During the debate on the additional \$100 million to the Contras, the polls indicated that the American public did not understand this Nicaraguan policy. Communist hysteria however, overrode this argument. Who are we representing, anti-Sandinistas or Americans?

It is unfortunate that very few of us have taken the time to visit these decorated veterans. It is a shame, for we have not shown compassion for these dying Americans.

Their commitment, however, should be a warning to us for many of our constituents have written them letters of support and comfort. If they do not escape their fate, I submit to you that there will be genuine public interest on this issue that all of us will have to answer.

It would be wise for us to pay a little more attention to this cause.

RESOLUTION URGING THE PRESIDENT TO MEET WITH BLACK LEADERS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

(Mr. WALDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDON. Mr. Speaker, today, I am proud to introduce my first piece of legislation, a resolution urging President Reagan to meet with the leaders of the six "front-line states" that border South Africa. Zambian

President Kenneth Kuanda has invited Mr. Reagan to a summit meeting with these leaders, but an official White House spokesman said the President could not attend because he "just didn't have the time for this trip."

Well, President Reagan had better make time for the people of southern Africa. This is an unparalleled opportunity for him to improve relations between the United States and the independent black leadership in the region. Relations have been strained by the administration's opposition to necessary sanctions against South Africa and by the President's support for their pawns, the UNITA rebels. A southern African leadership summit would certainly help improve these relations and it would help widen his perspective.

A visit to Africa would enable the President to personally experience the unique political and social climate of southern Africa and to witness the grim realities of apartheid. I am convinced that this trip would open his eyes to the error of so-called "constructive engagement." This trip would help the President develop a southern African foreign policy based on firsthand experience and it could improve our relations with southern Africa for years to come.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5540, HEALTH CARE QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 5540, the Health Care Quality Improvement Act.

This has been cleared with the minority. We have worked very closely with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN] and with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TAUKE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks, and to include therein extraneous material, on the resolution, House Resolution 559, which was considered earlier today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, I was unavoidably absent for rollcalls 414 and 417 Thursday, September 25, 1986. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" for these votes, that passed H.R. 5495, authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and House Joint Resolution 738, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1987.

QUESTIONABLE COURT DECISION AGAINST DEMONSTRATIONS NEAR EMBASSIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FRANK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I previously addressed the House in a special order commenting on an outrageous decision by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in which they upheld an outdated statute, the validity of which has been called into question by Congress, which prevents anyone, even a lone demonstrator, from expressing political opinions within 500 feet of an embassy that might embarrass an embassy.

Judge Bork in upholding that made the extraordinary argument that we must show respect for the law of nations and he said that the law of nations allows us to arrest and criminally convict an individual who stood with a single sign outside the Nicaraguan Embassy, because he said under the law of nations we owe respect to the dignity of the Nicaraguan Embassy.

Apparently the law of nations does not protect the Government of Nicaragua from being assaulted by armed men with our money, but it does prevent a single individual from standing in front of them with a sign. I think if the Nicaraguan Government were given a choice of which protection to take, they probably would prefer to let the man stand there with a sign and not have their harbors mined; but Judge Bork did not resolve that conflict.

I noted at the time that I was uncertain of the exact legal status, because we are dealing now with a provision which is wholly within the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia.

What happens in this case is this. Congress did pass this statute saying no one could stand within 500 feet of an embassy with any kind of political expression that that embassy found unpleasant. That was many years ago.

When the District of Columbia got home rule, this statute, which I believe was passed in 1937, since it deals

only with the District of Columbia, became part of the District of Columbia law.

Now, it could theoretically be repealed by an act of Congress. I would oppose that.

I think it is a stupid and offensive law which offends the constitutional rights of Americans. I think people who have embassies here would be well-educated to learn that in this free country people can stand in front of their embassies with signs, as long as they are not disruptive, as long as they are no security threat, and can voice political opinions.

But I think the principle of home rule is an important one, so I have written to the District of Columbia Mayor and City Council and urged them to take action to repeal this.

I would note, I think it casts further disrepute on an opinion of Judge Bork's that is very worthy of disrepute, that in the report on the Terrorism Act which was passed last year by Congress, in one branch that law was actually repealed. In conference because of the respect that Members of this body have for home rule, the repeal was dropped and language was inserted in the report urging the government of the District of Columbia to take the necessary repeal or action.

I say that because in fact where Congress now has legislative jurisdiction dealing with diplomatic places of business and residents outside the District of Columbia, we have a far more constitutionally legitimate statute. We have a statute which in fact allows for some political opinion.

So we have this unfortunate law that is on the books because Congress passed it and the District of Columbia inherited it and Judge Bork, without due regard for the Constitution, in my judgment, upheld it.

I wanted to clarify that situation because I was unclear previously.

It is a law which we could technically repeal, but which we should not in deference to home rule, but which the District of Columbia should, and it is a law which one House of Congress already voted to repeal and the other House said, "You are right, it is a good law, but let us not violate home rule," and in the report cast doubt on it.

There will be an appeal for those people who were convicted. I hope the Supreme Court will show more respect for the Constitution than Judge Bork, but I hope our friends in the District of Columbia City Council and the Mayor will act to vindicate the constitutional rights, they have generally been very supportive of constitutional rights, and I hope they will take the appropriate action.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert into the RECORD here two documents: First, the relevant sections of the D.C. Code; second, the language from the confer-

ence report accompanying H.R. 4151 whereby the conferees express their conviction that this provision of the D.C. Code ought to be reviewed and probably amended by the District government to better reflect the constitutional values which received such short shrift from Judge Bork.

22-1115. INTERFERENCE WITH FOREIGN DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICES, OFFICERS, AND PROPERTY—PROHIBITED

It shall be unlawful to display any flag, banner, placard, or device designed or adapted to intimidate, coerce, or bring into public odium any foreign government, party, or organization, or any officer of officers thereof, or to bring into public disrepute political, social, or economic acts, views, or purposes of any foreign government, party, or organization, or to intimidate, coerce, harass, or bring into public disrepute any officer or officers or diplomatic or consular representatives of any foreign government, or to interfere with the free and safe pursuit of the duties of any diplomatic or consular representatives of any foreign government, within 500 feet of any building or premises within the District of Columbia used or occupied by any foreign government or its representative or representatives as an embassy, legation, consulate, or for other official purposes, except by, and in accordance with, a permit issued by the Chief of Police of the said District; or to congregate within 500 feet of any such building or premises, and refuse to disperse after having been ordered so to do by the police authorities of the said District. (Feb. 15, 1938, 52 Stat. 30, ch. 29, § 1; 1973 Ed., § 22-1115.)

22-1116. SAME—PENALTIES; EXCEPTION

The Superior Court of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction of offenses committed in violation of § 22-1115, and any person convicted of violating any of the provisions of said section shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$100 or by imprisonment not exceeding 60 days, or both: Provided, however, that nothing contained in said section shall be construed to prohibit picketing, as a result of bona fide labor disputes regarding the alteration, repair, or construction of either buildings or premises occupied, for business purposes, wholly or in part, by representatives of foreign governments. (Feb. 15, 1938, 52 Stat. 30, ch. 29, § 2; Apr. 1, 1952, 56 Stat. 190, ch. 207, § 1; July 8, 1963, 77 Stat. 77, Pub. L. 88-60; § 1; July 29, 1970, 84 Stat. 570, Pub. L. 91-358, title I, § 155(a); 1973 Ed., § 22-1116.)

DEMONSTRATIONS AT EMBASSIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate amendment (sec. 702) amends section 112 of title 18, United States Code, to repeal the authority of the District of Columbia to set limits on the proximity of demonstrations at foreign diplomatic buildings.

The House bill contains no comparable provision.

Current District of Columbia law makes it a crime to congregate within 500 feet of a foreign mission and to refuse to disperse when ordered to do so by the police. The conference substitute (sec. 1302) expresses the sense of Congress that the District law may be inconsistent with the rights of free speech and assembly, and that there may have been selected enforcement of the law resulting in the unfair arrest of peaceful demonstrators; the obligation of the United States and the District to provide adequate security for the diplomatic missions of for-

eign governments must be balanced with the reasonable exercise of the rights of free speech and assembly; and therefore, the District of Columbia law should be reviewed by the District of Columbia Council and revised, if appropriate, to make it less intrusive on freedom of speech and assembly, while carrying out the legitimate purposes of providing adequate security for foreign diplomatic missions.

MILITARY SPENDING AS A CAUSE OF AMERICA'S INDUSTRIAL DECLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SEIBERLING] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the last 5 years have demonstrated the fallacy of so-called supply side economics, one of the big selling points used to gain enactment of the 1981 Reagan tax cut. That idea was that drastic cuts in individual income taxes, along with special tax breaks for businesses, would so stimulate the economy that total Federal revenues would soar, and there would be no long-term increase in the Federal deficit. Under this theory, it was not necessary to reduce expenditures, but only to cut taxes. Of course we now know the result—a doubling of the national debt in 5 years.

Yesterday, with the continuing resolution, the House again went through a tremendous exercise to try to meet essential needs of the Nation and at the same time to move toward a reduction in the colossal Federal deficit. Regardless of differences over how best to achieve this purpose, the abstract goal of deficit reduction is both fiscally essential and politically popular.

Paradoxically, however, despite people's well-founded concern about the Federal deficit, it is one source of President Reagan's popularity. And why wouldn't it be? Not only are their taxes lower, but in the last 5 years the American people have gotten over \$1 trillion more in Government service than they have paid for. And the result of this inadvertent Keynesianism has been an artificially fueled prosperity for many people. Unfortunately, at some point, living on credit has to end and the bills have to be paid.

There are already ominous signs, as Wall Street is beginning to recognize. Economic growth is at a virtual standstill. The trade deficit continues to skyrocket. Agriculture is already in a depression. Factory production is well below capacity. Unemployment throughout America's heartland is unacceptably high, and workers by the thousands are being laid off in basic industries. Worse yet, with such huge deficits, the ability of the Federal Government to "pump prime" the economy in the event of a major recession is seriously weakened, if not crippled.

President Reagan continues to insist that the reason for our predicament is that the Congress failed to cut enough domestic spending. Well, we now have a 5-year record against which to test the validity of this charge. Let's take a look at it:

The Congressional Budget Office on May 30, 1986, released an analysis comparing current tax and spending levels with what they would have been if the policies in effect before the adoption of Reagan's programs in 1981 had remained in effect through fiscal year 1986.

According to the CBO, the 1981 tax cuts caused a net loss of \$468 billion in Federal revenue from fiscal year 1982 through fiscal year 1986, even taking into account action the Congress has taken since 1981 to restore some of the lost revenue. A higher rate of defense spending has increased the budget deficit by a net of \$108 billion over the same period. Interest on the resulting additions to the deficit added another \$58 billion.

During the same period, Congress reduced nondefense discretionary spending by nearly \$300 billion. But this reduction has been more than offset by the \$468 billion revenue loss from the 1981 tax cuts alone, not to mention the increase in interest on the debt and the increase in defense spending—which added another \$166 billion of deficit.

According to CBO, if pre-1981 tax and spending policies had remained in effect, the Federal deficit in fiscal year 1986 would be \$92 billion. This would still be too high for a nonrecession year, but contrast this with the record \$230 billion budget deficit now projected for the fiscal year ending 4 days from now.

If there had been no change in Federal tax policy, but Congress had made the spending cuts it has made since 1981, the CBO deficit projection for 1986 would be a mere \$69 billion. And, if there had been no defense spending increases beyond the 3 percent per year of the fiscal year 1981 budget, the 1986 deficit projection would be only \$38 billion. A deficit of this level in a \$2 trillion economy would be considered by many economists as practically the equivalent of a balanced budget.

But we must deal with things as they are, not as they might have been. In June of this year, the House and Senate approved a compromise budget for fiscal year 1987 which would cut the deficit below the Gramm-Rudman mandatory target of \$144 billion, and which would cut defense spending \$28 billion below the President's request, while generally freezing domestic programs. But the upward revision of the anticipated deficit for fiscal year 1986, and expected increases in the deficit for fiscal year 1987 above the levels forecast when the budget resolution

was adopted indicate that we have to pare Federal spending further. This may prove to be impossible if the economy continues to slow down. It will certainly be impossible if we do not take steps to further slow and, eventually, reverse the militarization of the Federal budget.

We are currently in the middle of the largest peacetime defense buildup in the history of the Nation. From fiscal year 1982 to fiscal year 1986, Congress has approved \$1.3 trillion in budget authority for national defense. Over the next 5 years, the President wants to spend nearly \$2 trillion more.

In addition to vast increases in general defense spending, the major defense policy initiative under the administration—star wars, or SDI—threatens to push defense spending—and with it the deficit—beyond the stratosphere. Star wars research alone is budgeted at \$30 billion over 5 years. A fully deployed SDI system could cost upward of \$1 trillion.

About 98 percent of the defense budget produces nothing of use to the civilian economy. On the other hand, the job of 1 of every 10 Americans depends directly or indirectly on defense spending. The Pentagon is the Nation's single largest purchaser of goods and services.

Defense work involves: 11 percent of our computer programmers; 25 percent of our scientists and engineers; and 50 percent of our aerospace technicians. Obviously, military spending creates jobs. But the jobs it creates are highly specialized and expensive. The Council on Economic Priorities estimates that \$1 billion spent on military defense creates 28,000 jobs. The same amount spent on public transit would create 32,000 jobs. On consumer goods and services, 57,000 jobs. And on education, 71,000 jobs.

From an economic standpoint, the question is not whether military defense spending creates new jobs, but what does it do to the economic strength of the Nation, from which our military defense is derived?

In a remarkable column published in the August 25 Akron Beacon Journal, noted economic columnist Hobart Rowen makes a compelling case that our desperate slide in the international trade market can be directly linked to Congress and the President's failures to discipline the Pentagon's appetite. As Rowen notes:

It's no exaggeration to say that we have borrowed to the hilt to finance a bloated military budget, and that this overcommitment—to military spending—is a root cause of current economic distress.

We cannot blithely dismiss the debt problem, as we could in the 1930's, by saying "We owe it to ourselves." Today, much of the budget deficit is being financed by the savings of people living abroad. Between 1982 and 1986, we borrowed more than \$400

billion overseas. The United States has become the world's largest debtor.

In short, we are borrowing from abroad to finance the defense buildup. In the long run, those bills will cause, and even now are causing, a catastrophic decline in American competitiveness, productivity, and capital investment, and a shifting away from the United States as the chief financial and industrial power in the world.

In her 1985 edition of "World Military and Social Expenditures" the distinguished scholar Ruth Leger Sivard documents the strong correlation between high rates of military spending and low gains in productivity. Among developed countries, Japan, with the lowest military expenditures as a percent of gross national product—1 percent—is at the top in productivity growth—9 percent per year. The U.S.S.R. is at the top in military expenditures as a percent of GNP—12 percent—and next to the bottom productivity growth—3 percent. The United States holds the bottom position in productivity growth—2.5 percent—and next to the top in military expenditures—7 percent of GNP in the period 1966-82.

The Congressional Research Service reports the United States had shown a steady decline in spending on civilian science. At the same time, countries like Japan and West Germany, which are our biggest high technology rivals, have relatively small defense budgets and have thus been able to promote dramatic increases in spending on civilian science. They are exploiting that advantage every day in the international trade market.

As Akio Morita, chairman of Sony Corp. said:

American companies have either shifted output to low-wage countries, or come to buy parts from countries like Japan that can make quality products at low prices. The result is a hollowing of American industry. The U.S. is abandoning its status as an industrial power.

The budget deficits which have resulted from the combination of revenue losses and defense spending increases have helped keep the dollar overvalued. That, coupled with lax enforcement of our trade laws and declining productivity in American industry, produced last year's record \$148 billion trade deficit. We're headed for an even bigger trade deficit this year.

Certainly, we must be prepared to take strong action to discourage our trading partners from engaging in unfair trade practices. The House, in May, approved a major overhauling of the Nation's trade laws which would streamline the operation of our unfair trade laws and remove some of the President's discretion to ignore case of unfair trade. The House-passed trade bill would also put pressure on countries to bring their wages, working

conditions, collective bargaining laws, and occupational safety and health laws up to internationally recognized standards. American workers should not have to compete against sweatshop labor.

But even with fair trade, our region, and the United States as a whole, has no choice but to increase the competitiveness of our current industries if we are to preserve the standard of living of our people and continue as a major economic power.

The United States now ranks 18th among countries graduating engineers with postgraduate degrees. Our high school completion rate is 73 percent compared to Japan's 90 percent. Less than 7 percent of U.S. education is financed by the Federal Government, and that figure is declining at all levels. In contrast, nearly 50 percent of education in Japan is financed by the National Government. It is ironic that excessive military spending is depriving our children of the educational edge on which the future security of the Nation, as well as its individual citizens, depends.

Excessive military spending is hurting the American people in still another serious way—one all too often overlooked. The United States does not exist in isolation. For example, every day, we are becoming more aware of our environmental interdependence. The accelerating destruction of tropical rain forests, for example, will wipe out the winter habitat of many species of our own native birds, probably rendering them extinct. It will also substantially reduce the global conversion of carbon dioxide back to oxygen, thereby accelerating the "greenhouse effect," which, if not reversed, could within 100 years turn much of the United States into a permanent dust bowl. Acid rain, fluorocarbons, DDT, nuclear fallout, and other forms of airborne pollutants are carried by air currents around the world, with potentially devastating effects on forests, crops, wildlife, and eventually on people.

Overpopulation, extreme poverty, and political backwardness in the countries where most of the world's people live make it extremely difficult to deal with these environmental problems, not to mention the economic, social, and political ones. Failure to deal effectively with the problems of poverty which affect two-thirds of the human race, leads to increased social and political instability and opens the way for Communist, Maoist, fascist, or religious extremists to take power. Neither democracy nor civilization itself can long exist in the world if most of the people sink into mass starvation, as is already happening in much of Africa.

Military power cannot deal effectively with these types of problems. In

fact, excessive reliance on military power, as presently pursued by both the Soviets and the Reagan administration, often makes the problems worse. This is especially true insofar as the arms race diverts money and other resources away from productive uses.

How serious this diversion is, both in a moral and political sense, is dramatically brought out in Ruth Sivard's study of "World Military and Social Expenditures." She summarizes this way:

Militarization also has many links to today's troubled social conditions. Before any weapons are used, they have already taken a human toll. The economic burden is felt most directly through the diversion of resources from urgent present needs of society, but it also promises an unconscionable legacy for future generations: Built-in inflation; the burden of long-term debt; an environment and infrastructure deteriorating through neglect; alienation and unrest growing out of economic inequities.

At the same time the foreign aid, which could have meant new hope for millions living in desperate poverty, was also curtailed by military factors. While developed countries engaged in a massive arms race, their annual military expenditures—in current prices—rose by \$459 billion between 1960 and 1983, their economic aid by a mere \$25 billion. After allowance for inflation, military expenditures of the developed countries were up 80 percent. But for the recipients of their development aid there was no increase in real terms over the 24 years.

The record of the two military superpowers was especially poor. The United States ranked among the lowest of the contributors in relation to its GNP, providing under 0.3 percent for economic aid. The U.S.S.R. . . . lagged even further behind, only occasionally reaching as high as 0.15 percent of its GNP.

Estimates of the extent of hunger in the world range widely but there is general agreement that more than 1 billion people are chronically undernourished. Deaths related to starvation average 50,000 a day. In Africa alone, 5 million children died from hunger related causes in 1984. Millions more have died since.

Beyond the mismatch between food supplies and population, there is the fundamental problem of poverty. The fact is that the people who are malnourished in much of the Third World simply cannot afford to buy the food that is available, or even to grow it for themselves. More than half the people in the rural areas are landless. Hunger persists, therefore, as one apparently fixed piece in the tragedy of underdevelopment. If it is to be eliminated, there will have to be a commitment of resources and political will, by rich and poor countries together, that is not yet evident in the militarized world of 1986.

The situation with respect to education, which could help break the vicious cycle of poverty, malnutrition, and poor health, has gotten worse, not better, over the last two decades. In 1983, there were at least 100 million

more children out of school worldwide than there were in 1960. With world military expenditures reaching \$800 billion in 1983, public expenditures for educating the world's 1.5 billion school age children were 8 percent less than military expenditures. In developing countries, there are, on the average, only 2 teachers per 1,000 school age children. We worry, and rightly so, when the teacher-pupil ratio in our classrooms is more than 1 to 25.

The picture on health care is even worse. In developing countries, there is, on the average, less than 1 physician per 10,000 people. Government budgets for health average \$14 per capita, and drop to \$1 or less in some countries.

The other day, I heard on public radio a doctor from an African country report that 10 percent of the children in his country are being born with AIDS virus in their bloodstreams! There lie the makings of a worldwide plague comparable to the black death. Yet there are insufficient funds even to sterilize the syringes used over and over to administer injections to these and other children, so the disease spreads.

Whether looked at from the standpoint of our own economic salvation or the preservation of a viable world, it all comes down to the same thing. Hobart Rowen sums it up this way:

We must cut back the huge Federal deficit and stop pouring the Nation's wealth down a military drain. We must find ways of achieving arms control and détente with the Soviet Union, and thus regain the means to finance a revitalization of our own economy and that of the Third World.

The preliminary budget passed by the Congress for fiscal year 1987, though it reduces only the rate of increase in defense spending is at least a small step in the direction of defense cuts. The next Congress will have to make some major steps in that direction. Meanwhile, the President should explore whether the Soviets are really serious about arms control and arms reduction, as they appear to be. To do that, he must get serious about it himself, and let his subordinates know it. Congress cannot negotiate treaties. Only the President can do that. Whether he does may depend on what he hears from the American people in the next few months, particularly in the kind of Congress they elect this November.

I do not underestimate the difficulty of dealing with the Soviet Government. The recent arrest and detention of American journalist Nicholas Daniloff in Moscow on trumped-up charges is but one more indication of the profound gap in values between the two superpowers—a gap that breeds further mistrust and makes negotiations affecting national security extremely difficult. Nevertheless, there is no al-

ternative to such negotiations if either country is to have much of a future.

It may be that one of the reasons we have failed in the past is because the leaders of the superpowers have focused too much on the threat each country poses to the other, and not enough on the benefits each can achieve by a reduction of the threat, not by adding weapons but by getting rid of them, together. In a postscript entitled "Bringing Star Wars Down to Earth," Ms. Sivard lays out an interesting scenario. She says:

Imagine if, instead of chasing the chimeras of star wars and evanescent military gaps, the political leadership of the two greatest powers agreed to focus on the real gaps, the universal needs of humanity on planet Earth . . .

The dream scenario goes as follows:

Each superpower independently cleverly decides that the only sane objective is to lower the opponent's military threat, rather than racing endlessly to keep ahead of him. Each grasps the opportunity in negotiations to make substantial cuts in the opponent's nuclear forces and to put an end to all nuclear and antisatellite testing. Budgetary savings for the two countries are conservatively estimated at two trillion dollars over the next 10 years.

In the euphoria of success, the superpowers decide to invite the whole world to share in half the savings. (The other half is to be used to reduce the budget deficit in the United States and to improve the lot of consumers in the U.S.S.R.) Together, the United States and U.S.S.R. announce that \$100 billion a year will be made available for an unprecedented human development program, to which other nations are asked to contribute in proportion to their military expenditures. Global response is immediate and wildly enthusiastic.

To those who say it sounds like an impossible dream, I say: If a leader of the stature of a Franklin Roosevelt offered such a proposition as part of an arms control package, it would be almost irresistible. Ronald Reagan, who claims to hold Roosevelt as his hero, has a historic opportunity. If he grasps it, he will find that he has the support of the overwhelming majority of the American people, and, indeed, of the whole world. But if he does not act soon, the opportunity may be lost, perhaps forever.

□ 1310

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEIBERLING. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Iowa, one of the finest Members in the House of Representatives [Mr. BEDELL].

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement, and as we both leave the Congress, I think frequently we are unaware of the esteem with which one is held by his peers.

I want the gentleman in the well to know that since I first came to Congress, he has set an example that I have treasured very much. I have

looked to the way he has served, as I have tried to serve here in the Congress, and I know I am not alone in those people who appreciate the tremendous service he has given to the country, and the great example he has set for the rest of us.

Mr. SEIBERLING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, without doubt, we could all say exactly the same thing about my dear friend, who has also set an outstanding example and who, like me, is leaving the Congress at the end of the year, but not leaving the cause of freedom and the cause of humanity.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. LUNGREN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, I just must say that today was probably the most bittersweet victory that I have had in the House of Representatives. Bittersweet because I in fact have been working for 8 years, the 8 years I have been in the Congress, for immigration reform. I have been on this floor many, many times. I sustained an effort to put pressure on the leadership two Congresses ago, so that we might have immigration reform. We were finally successful in having that immigration reform package on the floor in the waning days of that year; in fact in the lameduck session.

A rule was granted that time which gave a totally open rule, which allowed every amendment under the Sun in order, and some who were opposed to that particular bill made 200 to 300 amendments in order; that is, filed them, and were ready to go with them, and that and the combination of time killed the bill.

Then in the last Congress, working with others, we put pressure on the House to finally bring the immigration bill up. Unfortunately it was delayed, and delayed, and delayed, and delayed for a combination of reasons, some political; we were promised it in January of that year, then February, then March, then April, then May. Then had what we thought was an ironclad commitment to bring it to the floor of the House in June 1984, the first week; but at that time a phone call from a Presidential candidate Mr. Mondale to the leadership here indicating that if Members had to take positions on immigration reform prior to the Democrat and Republican primaries in California, that that would affect the outcome of that primary. As a result, that was put off again until after the California primary.

That put it right in the Presidential season between the, or right at the time of the two Presidential conventions; it made it more partisan than before. By the time we finally got back

here and dealt with it and went to conference, we had a month left. We spent a month in conference and were unsuccessful.

In this Congress, I have been working as hard as I could to have immigration reform. I introduced the first comprehensive immigration reform bill in this Congress; taking much of what was done in the conference from last Congress, trying to take those areas where we had reached agreement, and then in some areas where there was not agreement, going with what I thought was the proper course.

I have been a sponsor of legislation on the guest-worker question for 8 years in the Congress. Yet today I led the fight to first of all vote down the previous question and allow us to have a different rule presented; and then when we were just short on that vote, led the fight to defeat the rule.

Some might ask why. In fact, I guess I ask myself why at times. I suppose it comes out of the fact that many of us believe that immigration reform is important, and along with immigration reform, we have to do something to settle the question about the need for foreign workers in agriculture, a need that has been manifest for well over 100 years, a need that we could control, could identify, a need that we could channel into a legal form.

And yet the rule presented to us today denied us an opportunity to vote on that fundamental question. When I asked members of the Rules Committee why I was denied that opportunity, I was told, because they knew I would be successful. What does that mean? Not that I would be successful because of rhetoric or oratory or anything like that; but rather that the amendment I would present would prevail in the House because it would be the majority will.

In other words, we were to understand that because the Rules Committee had figured out that that particular approach to the guest-worker question would prevail on the floor of the House, and because the chairman of the Judiciary Committee disagreed with the sentiment of the House, we would therefore not allow the House to vote on that.

□ 1320

Not only would we have had a guest-worker approach, but it would have been in lieu of what is in the present bill.

Let me just say this: that which is in the present bill, the so-called Schumer amendment, was described as an abomination, as an outrage and as whacko.

Mr. Speaker, those three things were said about that proposal by its proponents. I do not have time to tell you what was said about it by its opponents.

Why would even its proponents say it was an abomination, it was outrageous, it was whacko? Because they could not justify saying to everybody in America we are going to set up a rule in which anybody who worked in agriculture in the United States from May 1, 1985 to May 1, 1986 and was here illegally while he or she did it, can waltz right in and get a green card, permanent resident status in America, qualify for citizenship in 5 years, immediately be able to petition for every member of his or her family to come into the United States and be eligible for most forms of welfare.

Now, there was a change made that denied them AFDC, but other forms of welfare would be allowed and there was no restriction or no authority granted to the States to have any further restriction on welfare eligibility for these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. I would like to congratulate not only the gentleman in the well, Mr. LUNGREN, but I thank the majority of the House of Representatives for what took place in this Chamber today. I think the message is true, and I think it certainly will be read this way and it certainly should, and that is that, the democratic process, given all of those whether they be in the majority or the minority of the Members in this House, give them an opportunity to be heard, give them an opportunity to make their case and then let the Members vote on it so that the democratic process can go forward. The democratic process is of far greater importance than any particular bill that has ever gone through this House. I think we must not lose sight of that. Today the gentleman in the well and some other members of the Committee on the Judiciary—and I was pleased to join in this effort—took on the leadership of that committee. The leadership of that committee was saying, "Play my way or we don't play. We don't conference unless the conference comes out the way I want it to."

Never can Members of this House be cowed to that process. I think that is what the message is that is going out today, that we are not going to cow down to a blatantly unfair process that is arbitrarily set up by some in high positions in this House that would stop the democratic process from going forward.

I say this is a tremendous bright day in the history of this House. I would predict that if immigration does not come back to us this year, and I think that the chances are very good that it will come back this year, but if it does not, it is going to come back with the enthusiasm that we are seeing now that is being shared by the Members

of the House trying to turn out some meaningful drug legislation.

The American people know there is a problem out there, and they are going to insist on their body, the people's body here in the House of Representatives, turning out some meaningful and good legislation in this area.

I know the gentleman from California has been in the leadership of this fight, as has the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI], and I am sure that, even though you are split today on this rule, that you are going to work together and you are going to come out and that the Rules Committee, after they get over the loss they have suffered today, or the vote of no confidence that they have received today, that they would come forward and if not in this Congress, in a future Congress, craft a rule that will give this House an opportunity to vote on good meaningful immigration reform.

Other than the question of drugs, there is no domestic legislation that I feel is any more important than immigration reform.

I hope the gentleman will continue the fine work and the fine fight that he has been putting up. It is nice to see David beat Goliath once in a while in this House, and that is exactly what happened here today.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his remarks. He is, of course, a member of that Committee on the Judiciary and, being from Florida, is extremely interested in the immigration issue and has worked hard on it.

I know he, too, was torn about what we had to do here. But I think in the long run we were correct in what we did.

Beyond what I have said about the Schumer amendment, I ought to indicate to my colleagues that it has a replenishment aspect to it. That is, in addition to that original group, unknown numbers, by the way; some have said maybe only 250,000, others have said maybe 350,000, maybe 500,000; after those people have come in for a year there is a replenishment program that continues on for 12 years. In that replenishment program they bring in new workers from foreign countries but not as temporary workers. Rather, we grant them a temporary status for a year in which time they have to work 60 days in agriculture, but as long as they do that for a period of time, they then get permanent resident status and get citizenship 5 years after they get their permanent resident status.

Again, a preference is given to those individuals who have been here illegally since before 1986. In other words, what is going to happen is if the rule had prevailed, it would have put us in a position of accepting as a bill, because we could not amend it, a bill which had a legalization provision

upon which I think we could get a consensus. It was based on the fact that people had been here for a long period of time, they had roots in our community, they were willing to accept additional obligations, that is to know English or to learn English, to know American history and government or be involved in a course of study for American history and government. It would have been a one-time-only thing. It would have required, to show that people had substantial roots in the community, that it would be folks who had been living here continuously for some period of time. We had not settled on a particular date. Probably the conference would have ended with 1982. And what would occur then would be that we would send a pure and simple message out, "Don't expect another legalization. We were doing this extraordinary thing, we were granting this extraordinary relief giving the people a right to citizenship in the United States on a one-time-only basis. It will not be repeated."

But then we would have another section in the bill which would say, "Well, if you happen to have worked in agriculture for 60 days during this 1-year period of time, you go to the head of the line of everybody. We don't care if you're a Mexican national who has been living in Mexico after making an application to come to the United States and waiting for a number to come up for the last 10 years, this individual, your next door neighbor who came and worked 60 days in agriculture illegally in the United States last year will go to the head of the line. We don't care if you're from the Philippines and because the numbers are used up, you have to wait for 12 years to come here. You continue to wait while someone who got in here illegally and worked 60 days in agriculture goes to the head of the line." In fact, we say to those people in the regular program, "Only if you have been here a substantial period of time are you going to qualify for legalization. But if you worked for 60 days, have no other connection to the United States, never been here before, never been here after, had no intent of having a long-term commitment to the United States, no intent of trying to study American history and government, no intent of studying English, no intent of becoming a part of America, you go to the head of the line, you become a permanent resident of the United States, and in 5 years you have the opportunity for citizenship." How much is that worth in the world today? If you could offer American citizenship on the open market, if that is how crass we want to be about it, how much would it be worth? I would suggest in any event it is worth more than 60 days work in agriculture. Yet, had the rule been adopted, we would have had no attempt to amend

that, we would have had to accept it as it was presented to us, and it had to be part of the bill.

It was one of many features of that rule that was voted down.

Another feature of the rule, which I mentioned earlier, was that 23 separate amendments were adopted and incorporated in the bill itself; that is, became parts of the bill when the rule was adopted. They change the bill. Twenty-three amendments that never would have any opportunity of debate, once they got in the bill you could not change it.

One of those was granting EVD. That happens to be a technical term for extended voluntary departure. It means you permatize, you legalize people who are here illegally until such time as another event takes place.

What has happened is every single EVD that has been granted in the past has been every single person granted extended voluntary departure in the United States. EVD was something that use to be given as blanket authority to the Attorney General to take care of refugee problems.

EVD was how the people from Hungary came here after the Hungarian revolution. EVD was the way Cubans came here. In 1980 this Congress decided that we were not going to do that anymore. There was an ad hoc approach to it, oftentimes subject to political influence, depending on whatever administration was in office. We were going to establish a criterion to govern the admission of refugees into this country. We would adopt the United Nations protocol, expanding our definition of refugees, basically saying a refugee is someone who has a well-founded fear of persecution based on five different criteria such as persecution for religious belief, for political belief, because of belonging to a particular ethnic group, et cetera. We said that is the way we want it to happen in the future. We are not going to use EVD anymore.

We are going to set up a procedure that is not subject to political manipulation. Everyone will be viewed the same and individually. That is what happened with countless refugees around the world. Yet in this bill if we had adopted the rule, an amendment would have been thrown into it on which we could not do anything, we could not vote on it up or down by itself, in which every single Salvadoran and every single Nicaraguan in this country before November of this past year would be able to stay here forever.

Now, some people say well, look, they are having problems down in El Salvador and we should allow every Salvadoran to be here. That was a cry we had in this Congress over the last couple of years. As a result, the rank-

ing Republican of the Committee on the Judiciary, HAMILTON FISH, and others came up with a plan where we would follow every single Salvadoran who was deported from the United States back to his home country. For the last 2 years that has been done, not by the U.S. State Department, not by the U.S. Justice Department, not by any agency of the U.S. Government, but by ICEM, which is an international organization that helps with migration of people. It started in the aftermath of World War II to put displaced people into homelands following World War II. Then it extended worldwide. ICEM meets every single deportee from the United States to El Salvador, sees if they can help them, gives them postcards to send back to them so that they can check on them, and then goes out and checks on them. And in 2 years how many people have they found were killed when they went back to El Salvador after being deported by the United States? Because that was the argument heard as to why we must grant extended voluntary departure to all Salvadorans. Two people, two people have died in that entire period of time. One was killed trying to perform an armed robbery, and the other died in a barroom brawl in a dispute over a soccer match.

No other death has been shown. And that is not by the United States, that is by an international organization.

The other fact, that people do not like to talk about, is that Salvadoran nationals are the second largest group of illegal aliens apprehended in the United States now, but have been for 24 straight years. They were coming all norte before Duarte, before D'Aubuisson, before the Communists, before everything. For 24 years Salvadorans have been the second largest group of illegal aliens in the United States. They are coming because, basically, for economic reasons, and I do not blame them. The point is we cannot determine our immigration problems because of the problems of another country's economics. Yet, we would have been required under the rule that was up upon its adoption to allow every single Salvadoran and Nicaraguan in this country illegally to be granted extended voluntary departure no matter when they came in before November.

Now, that is a subject that needs to be debated, a subject that needs to be voted on. It is a subject that probably should not be in this bill but even let us grant them the right to have it in this bill, which was not from any of the committees, we ought to have the right to vote that up or down because I think the American people would like us to do that.

What it is is an extension of the sanctuary movement. It is permatizing and giving Government direction and recognition to a sanctuary movement,

something which has been rejected by INS, which has been rejected by the Justice Department, which has been rejected by the Government and which has never gotten anyplace on the floor of the House when independently voted.

□ 1335

Yet we would have been required if we adopted the rule today on the immigration bill to accept that into the bill and have no opportunity to vote on it.

In other words, we were told this: If you want immigration reform, we are going to hold you up on the floor. You have got to accept what we want you to accept, even though we know we could not pass it on the floor if it were required to be voted on. Ladies and gentleman and my colleagues, it just seems to me that is not the way we ought to do business here.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is this. There are many of us who are genuinely concerned about immigration reform. We have been working on it on a bipartisan fashion. I truly regret that partisanship erupted, as least as reflected in the Rules Committee on the rule that was passed out here. To deny a Member an opportunity to offer an amendment on the most controversial issue within the immigration bill for the reason that that Member would be successful and, therefore, suggesting that Member's amendment was what the majority wanted is not the way we ought to do business here.

Now some are saying that those of us who opposed the rule today have killed immigration reform. I hope that is not true. It does not have to be true. But let us not have any finger pointing. Let us talk about where we are right now.

Many of us have suggested for a long period of time that we ought not to let immigration go to the end of the year. I said that weekly, monthly, even daily at times for the last 2 years.

We have commemorated more days, we have commemorated more anniversaries, we have commemorated more quarter-century anniversaries, we have commemorated more diseases than perhaps any other Congress. But while doing all those things, and all of those things are certainly valuable, we pushed immigration reform again to the back of the calendar. And now since we are at the back of the calendar, we are told to accept the rule that we give you that denies the will of the House or you kill immigration reform. I do not accept that, Mr. Speaker. There is time today. There is time this weekend. There is time Monday. There is time Tuesday for the Rules Committee to reconvene and send back the rule they know they can pass in this House.

If the leadership truly wants to give the Members of the House of Representatives an opportunity to work its will on the immigration bill, the Rules Committee can reconstitute itself and can vote out a bill that they know we can pass on the floor. We told them what it was they could pass on the floor. And we could be involved with immigration reform next week. To say it is too late is to beg the question. Those who make it very late ought not to be able to use the excuse that now it is too late to do anything about it.

The Speaker has told us in the past that he alone controls the schedule. The Speaker has said on the floor that no one else does, he does. Mr. Speaker, you control the schedule, you can get it back up.

We have been told time and again that the Speaker's party controls the Rules Committee. It controls by a 2-to-1-plus-1 majority in the Rules Committee. What does that mean? That means they can pass out any rule they wish to with a 2-to-1-plus-1 margin, Democrat over Republican. If they want to pass out a rule, they can schedule it right now. In the last couple of weeks we have had meetings of the Rules Committee scheduled as soon as a rule was defeated on the floor or as soon as they made a decision. In some cases it was even a little late telling the Republican Members that the Rules Committee was meeting. They were nice enough to let us know just before the rule was voted out.

But the point is they can convene it anytime, and that rule can come out. If they truly want immigration reform, we can still act.

Some said that those of us on our side who voted against the rule because we did not get our way are no better or worse than they are because all they wanted to do was to get their way.

But there is an essential difference. We said, just give us a vote. We will accept the will of the House.

I was asked in the Rules Committee by a Democratic Member, MARTIN FROST of Texas, if you have the opportunity to offer your alternative to the Schumer amendment, the so-called Wilson amendment, which basically parrots the Panetta-Morrison amendment which passed on this floor by about a 56-vote margin 2 years ago, and you are not successful, would you support the overall immigration bill?

I said that if I had my fair shot on the floor and we had an up or down vote on it and I lost, even though I thought I should have prevailed, I would still go forward and vote for the bill because I believe in immigration reform. That is all we are asking.

It just seems awfully strange that in the people's House, the place that we bring children to, the place that high

school classes come for their senior trip to see what democracy is all about, that we say Members are wrong or Members are obstructionists if they ask for a simple vote on an issue that has already proven itself to be crucial to the overall issue being then considered. How can you say that Members are truly Members of the House of Representatives if they are denied the right to represent their constituents? How can you say this is the House of the people if the people's representatives are denied the chance to have a vote on the question of whether you are going to legalize 250,000 to 300,000 people whose only claim of a connection to the United States is they worked 60 days last year in agriculture?

Thank God we do not extend it to ice hockey, because most fellows from Canada who come down here to play ice hockey play more than 60 games. Thank God we do not give it to every Italian singer who comes over here, or every international actor who comes over or every businessman who comes over here or every student. We grant student visas and students are in the United States longer than 60 days. Should we not give them citizenship rights because they have been in this country 60 days?

Look at it the other way. Does anybody think any other country would say to any American, "Yes, you have been in our country 60 days, so we are going to grant you full permanent residency rights. We are going to grant you citizenship rights in 5 years. And, oh, yes, by the way, with the exception of one welfare program, you will immediately be eligible for any and all welfare programs that we have. Oh, and yes, you can petition to have all of your family come in as permanent residents and citizens because you have worked here for 60 days."

The country of Mexico does not allow you to work in that country unless you have a work permit, unless your work permit has been renewed and is up to date. And you have to go to their governmental agencies to get that permit on a regular basis. That is just to work there. Yet we are going to give citizenship away that much.

I have worked on this floor for the agricultural interests. I have taken a lot of political hits for working for the agricultural interests. But I happen to think they have a legitimate concern. I am not willing to work for the agricultural interests by selling out the rest of the country.

If the agricultural section that had been supposedly agreed to by this mysterious group that worked, if it did not affect the other parts of the bill, if it did not affect the idea of citizenship rights, if it did not affect the idea of legalization, if it did not affect the whole idea what it takes to be a citizen in this country and what it is worth to

be a citizen in this country, I would say let them work their deal and, if we can all sign off on it, OK.

But they did not do that. They went in to the area of citizenship, who is able to get citizenship rights and who is not able to get citizenship rights, who goes to the front of the line and who stays behind. It seems to me we cannot stand by and accept that. We still have time.

Let me just end with the three words that were used to describe this provision with which I have great objection: "abomination, outrageous, whacko." That is the description given for that particular provision by three of the people who voted for it.

I could tell you what I think about it but I would not be as mild.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNGREN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Would the gentleman tell me, did we not go through this same procedure last session?

Mr. LUNGREN. We did in terms of the lateness of the hour, but they gave us a fair rule last session, surprisingly.

Mr. FRENZEL. But they brought the bill up within the last 2 weeks of the session. The bill was filibustered to death by threat of amendment, as I recall.

Mr. LUNGREN. They did that two Congresses ago.

Mr. FRENZEL. And then they had 2 years, they being the House leadership in this case, to bring another bill back so that we could work on it with a reasonable procedure and a chance for the House to work its will.

Can the gentleman tell me why we waited until 2 weeks or 1 week before we are to adjourn before that bill came to the floor of the House?

Mr. LUNGREN. I can only surmise, but I would suggest this to the gentleman. I have been told time and again that if we had an opportunity to vote on the package on agriculture that we had dealt with on the floor before, that we would be successful and, therefore, they were going to do everything they could to deny us that opportunity. If they brought it up too early in the session, it would be easier to defeat a rule. If you bring it up late in the session, they blame you for killing the bill.

I suggest that is the position they put us in. The rule was killed, but we did not kill the rule and the rules prospects. They did by placing it where it was with the rule they had.

Mr. FRENZEL. So the House leadership was nervous about having a vote in the House. Anything as undemocratic as letting the Members express their preference was not acceptable?

□ 1345

Mr. LUNGREN. I was told specifically by members of the Rules Commit-

tee on the other side of the aisle that is precisely why they denied the rule that we asked for because they knew that we would prevail.

Mr. FRENZEL. So, in effect, the leadership of this House does not want a bill if it is the bill the House wants.

Mr. LUNGREN. Not only that, but the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee mentioned on the floor, and then afterward in a press conference at which I was attending just outside these doors, that if the bill contained the will of the House on that question, he would not bring it to conference; he would do everything he could to kill it.

In other words, he is saying that if the will of the House prevails, he will kill the bill, and he was not going to allow that to happen; he wanted it to die aborning.

Mr. FRENZEL. If the gentleman will yield further, it is pretty clear that the House leadership and the House majority does not want an immigration bill, and if, as a majority they can do whatever they want, I think it is a shame. I think the House needed the bill.

I supported the bill 2 years ago even though there were many features of it to which I objected, particularly giving the prize of citizenship to people who have successfully broken our laws for a long period of time.

I object to that feature of the bill, yet I think we need a bill. I share the gentleman's regret that we do not have one. I must say that this was one of the House's more shabby hours this afternoon when we were given such an unacceptable set of choices instead of an opportunity for the House to work its will.

I thank the gentleman for his discussion. It has been helpful to me. I am not on the committee. I am glad to know how things work around here. I am glad for the information. I am disappointed to know how things work.

Mr. LUNGREN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I want to congratulate the gentleman as one of the people from a State which is not most affected by the illegal alien problem and who is not on the committee, who stuck with us last time and did work for the bill and did vote for passage of the bill when many did not.

Yet, at times when you are presented with an outrageous circumstance, you just cannot accept it. The point I want to stress, in concluding, is that we still have time. If they are truly interested in getting a bill through, the Speaker can schedule it, the Rules Committee, which we have been told they control, can get another rule out. We can get rid of the bad features of the rule that caused its defeat today. We can allow the House to work its will.

I do not think we have to accept threats that that will kill the bill. That is that the majority will not allow it to go to conference. I do not think they will do that; I have got more faith that they want an immigration bill too.

I think we ought to have a chance to vote on what the people want. We will decide what they want by the vote of their Representatives and go with that. I do not understand why the big "D" in democrat and the small "d" in democrat have to chance the notion of democracy. It ought to be same. Give us a chance to vote is all we are asking.

A MEMBER'S 12-YEAR MICROCOSM OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BEDELL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, as I come to the end of my 12 years of service here in the Congress, I have asked for this special time in order to talk about my appreciation for what my colleagues here have meant to me; to talk a little bit about my beliefs, my dreams for this Congress, my dreams for our country, to talk a little bit about how it is that I come to be in this great body.

Let me start by saying that I truly love it here. It is very difficult for me to leave. For those that do not know, I have suffered from a disease for over a year in that I was bitten by a wood tick and came down with a disease called Lyme's disease in which the symptoms have been very similar to mononucleosis for about a year. Under those circumstances, I felt that in spite of my love for this life and this body, it would not be right to my constituents to continue to serve here.

I am pleased to report that due to a series of shots some 2 months ago, it now appears that that disease is finally whipped and I have regained my normal health.

It is great to have been here because of the great people that serve in this body and it breaks my heart that so many, many times people talk about how terrible the Members of Congress may be. Let me say that I have never been in all my life with a finer group of people than I find here in the Congress.

I am thankful to my constituents for the fact that they have permitted me to serve these 12 years even though I am a Democrat in a very Republican district. I tell everything it really appears that I was born under a lucky star. All through my life, it has just seemed as if the Lord has smiled upon me.

The first time he smiled upon me was when he gave me the parents that he gave me and the grandparents and the brother that I had. From them I

believe I learned family values. I had parents that, whatever I wanted to do, said, "Well, Berk, why don't you go ahead and try?" Many times there were things that normal parents would have said do not do, that is foolish, but my parents said, "If you wish to try, go ahead."

My grandmother told me that you can do almost anything within reason if you will only set your mind to it. How right my grandmother was. My parents taught me to enjoy the great outdoors. I remember when my father and mother left me on the shores of one of our lakes as they went on down the lake with their fly rods, and, as I sat there with my cane pole and worm and pulled in my first fish, my father was so proud that the next day he had to take me downtown and get my picture taken and parade me around to his friends.

Some of the great joys I have had are camping in the wilderness, represented so well by my friend from Minnesota, fishing and hunting with my brother in the outdoors. Because of those experiences to some extent I was fortunate enough that, at the age of 15, I took \$50 I had saved from my newspaper route and started a business of making and selling fishing tackle.

It is a very interesting story of how that business grew and developed. I will not go into all of the details at this time, except to say that if it had not been for parents who said, "Go ahead, take our car and take the back off the front seat and build a bed and go out to sell your fishing leaders that you do not know how to make," at that time, if they had not said, "Go ahead and use your bedroom and use our living room and use the rest of the house as your factory, we will get by," that would not have happened.

As that business grew and developed, I finally came to the point where I realized that I had a sizable business on my hands and all I knew about management was what I had learned about my newspaper route. So I packed my bags and I went off to a management course for presidents that was put on by the American Management Association in Hamilton, NY.

There were 18 presidents at that course. In our area, there was the president of General Mills, the president of Minneapolis Honeywell and BERK BEDELL. I figured it out, and the average annual sales for the 18 that were in attendance was more than \$100 million per company. Let me tell you, it would have been much larger if I had not been there to bring the average down for all the others.

But I decided I should listen to what they had to say because if it was sufficiently important for people of that stature to take time from their lives to come to try to learn how to manage that I had better listen. Thank God I

did because it started to change my life.

At management course, they told us that the first thing you have to do if you are going to manage any operation of any kind is to determine what it is you are trying to accomplish with what you may be managing and to write it out. You would be surprised how few people can tell you just what it is they are trying to accomplish with what they are managing. It is not just to make a profit. Profits are of no value unless they serve some particular purpose.

So I went home and it took nearly 1 year to write out the goals and objectives of what we were trying to accomplish with this fishing tackle company that I had started. Then I said to myself, "BERK, if it is important for you to try to determine what you are trying to accomplish with your business and to write it out, surely it must be important for you to do that with your life, because surely your life is as important as your business."

I proceeded to write out my goals and objectives for the rest of the life that God has given me on this Earth and how I wanted to live the rest of that life. For a long time, I went around the country making speeches to people just urging them to get out a pencil and paper and start to write out what they wanted to do with the rest of the life they had here and how they wanted to live it.

□ 1355

Largely because of that, about 15 years ago, as my wife and I looked at our lives, we decided we wanted to try to do something about some of the concerns we had, so I hired a manager to manage my business and I spent 1 year just going around the country looking at what we might want to do in order to try to help with some of the problems that concern us.

Finally, I decided I wanted to run for Congress. I had a poll. The pollster said, "Don't run, you don't have a chance." But I remembered what my grandmother had told me, and I did. Here I am. What a wonderful experience this has been.

I came in with the wonderful class, the Watergate class, of the 94th Congress, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

It was one of the great experiences of my life as we first met in that class. I have always sort of been out of step at home. I was a Democrat among a whole group of Republicans. I was one of the first to feel that the Vietnam war was wrong, and spoke out in regard to it at a time when that was not a very popular thing to do.

I came in with those Members of this class, and here we were; we all agreed; we all wanted to do the same

thing. We all had the same values. If there ever was a fearless group, in my opinion, that was it.

They were articulate and unified and intelligent. They all wanted a clean environment and a peaceful world and an effective Government and concern for the underprivileged.

When I was looking around that year at what I wanted to do, one of the things I did was to stay at the home of a friend up in Connecticut along the seashore. At the time I was staying there, another guest in that same home was one of the astronauts.

The next morning, out in front of his home, they were shooting a movie with the astronaut. I will never forget what he had to say. He had a globe there and he said, "As we were traveling on that spaceship toward the Moon, we realized that the three of us had to work together with our limited space and limited resources and limited waste disposal system." He said, then, "As I was traveling, I looked out that little window and I saw that beautiful blue and white ball that we call Earth. I realized that was something special that God had put in this universe."

He said, then,

All of a sudden, a strange thing happened. All of sudden, I realized that that beautiful blue and white ball that we call Earth was a spaceship, just as surely was the one of which we were traveling. It had limited space and limited resources and limited waste disposal system, just as surely as did ours. But whereas we, the three of us, were working together to do everything we could to bring that journey through safely, recognizing those limitations, the crew of 3 billion people back on Earth were not doing the same.

How true he was.

One of the activities that I have participated in here in the Congress has been a prayer breakfast group that meets every Thursday morning at 8 o'clock. As we meet in that prayer breakfast group, each morning one of the Members talks to us about his faith and his belief and his life and his experiences. Only a few weeks ago, we were privileged to have our friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON], a Member of this body, talk to us about his experiences as he was on the last crew that went up in the space shuttle before the *Challenger* disaster.

He pointed out the same thing about his realization as he was up and looked back at our planet and how he realized how small this planet has become and how fragile it is. We realize at this time that we now have a sufficient nuclear weapons capability to, for the first time in the history of mankind, make this planet uninhabitable for human life.

It is not a cinch, but there are many scientists who would tell you that if we get into a major nuclear exchange with the Soviet Union, there is a substantial chance that we will destroy

the ability of this spaceship on which we live to sustain life here on our planet.

As we look at this planet, Earth, I would hope we would realize that we have to either learn to live together or die together. I hope we would recognize the problems of pollution and realize that we have a limited waste disposal system, just as did that spaceship.

I am pleased to say that in this area, I believe we are making progress in regard to pollution. It is no secret that I love to fish. Now I can fish in the Potomac River right in Washington, DC, and I can eat the fish that I catch from that river.

One of the great things that my family has enjoyed here in Washington is the great out-of-doors that is here and the great opportunity we have to enjoy that so close at hand.

Some people came in wanting to film me fishing here in Washington and have an interview with me. They wanted to set it up so that we would be able to tell that it was in Washington. So I took them down to a pond on the mall right near the Vietnam Memorial. Not only could they interview me fishing on that pond right on the mall, but as I was talking and fishing, they could see me catching a number of fish right here in the city limits.

I have friends who take me trout fishing and we can walk along a stream no more than 30 minutes from the city limits of Washington and fish for all morning, never seeing another person. So I would hope that as I leave Congress, those who are here would continue to appreciate the importance of continuing to preserve this great outdoors in which we live.

It is one of the great advantages that we have in living in this country that we are fortunate enough to live in.

I am thankful for not only the outdoor opportunity that exists here, but the many other opportunities that come with life in this Congress. I am thankful for the opportunities we have to learn. I know of no place where there are equivalent opportunities for us, for anyone, to learn as we have all the various briefings that are available, and where we can call almost anyone and they come and meet us and try to give us information on any issue that may be of concern to us.

I am thankful for the opportunity I have had to influence what happens in regard to small business, particularly with the background I had as I started in as a schoolboy with that \$50.

I am thankful for having been able to serve under our great chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MITCHELL]. I am thankful for the opportunity I have had to serve under the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. DE LA GARZA]. I feel kind of bad about that. When the gentleman was up for chairmanship of that committee, I did not think he should be chairman. I opposed him as chairman.

It was a mistake. I want to tell everyone that I have made a mistake. The gentleman has turned out to be a great chairman of that committee. He listens to all of us and he leads us well.

The great thing about the Committee on Agriculture is that it is not a partisan committee. The members on that committee are there to try to do what they can to help farmers.

I happen to believe that we have serious problems in agriculture, not only now, but into the future. I am fortunate enough to be chairman of the subcommittee that has to do with department operations, research, and foreign agriculture. On that committee, I have many colleagues, but there are two in particular that I wish to thank. That is the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the leading minority member of the committee, and my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. EVANS].

I happen to believe that our agriculture problem is not just a domestic problem. I think we have a world agriculture problem and I hope we can learn to come to work together to help to solve it, just as I hope we can do that with the other problems that we face on this spaceship planet on which we live.

□ 1405

I was very pleased that the work that has been done by our staff over many, many months on a bill that we passed here just in the last couple weeks that has to do with the regulation of pesticides, I think we broke some new ground in those negotiations, because normally what we do is, we each have our opinions of what should be done and we come and fight it out to see who wins; but in that particular legislation wherein we had the chemical companies, the farmers, the environmentalists, the big chemical companies and the small chemical companies, and all the other competing interests in disagreement, we simply got them together in a room and said, "Now, try to work out your differences, and if you don't do it today, come back tomorrow."

And as we came to the floor, there was only one item left of disagreement, whereas we had had any number of disagreements as we started. I wish we would do that in our society and in our world as we try to settle our differences.

It was my privilege to serve for a short time on the Foreign Affairs Committee while I was here. I was very active in the negotiations for a Law of the Sea Treaty. It broke my heart that one of the things that

killed that treaty was the attitude of the Government of this country and the sad thing was that it gave us an opportunity, in my opinion, to start to move toward a more peaceful world where we would agree upon how to use our different resources.

I may be prejudiced, but I think the reason that fell apart was because of the influence of the major mining companies in their believing that they should have the right to go out into the middle of the ocean and claim any minerals that are there unto themselves, and the other countries saying no, those are out in the middle of the ocean. They really should be shared by the world.

I believe that indeed we are going to have to come to where the world does share if we are going to preserve this great spaceship.

It has also been my privilege to work on many of the defense issues. I was pleased to be able to participate in doing something about the procurement practices that took place in the military.

I am very pleased to have been the author of the resolution that said that if the Soviet Union will continue not to test nuclear weapons, we call upon the President to try to negotiate a treaty to end the testing of nuclear weapons. This is the first President since Eisenhower that has not tried to negotiate such a treaty.

Now the Soviets have said, "We will stop, if you will just stop. We really don't have to negotiate. We have a treaty."

It breaks my heart that we have that opportunity and now it is passing by.

I am pleased that I have been able to work on some of the environmental issues that have taken place here in the Congress. It is no secret that I have not been very popular for opposing some of water projects that have been offered here in the Congress. My argument particularly is that we should not have taxpayers subsidizing water to enable farmers to grow crops that are in surplus. My argument is that it does not make sense if we have too much of a crop to pay a subsidy to farmers to get water to grow more crops so we can then turn around and pay those same farmers not to grow those crops.

I have been pleased that instead of the fact that most or many of the Members do not agree with me on that, that at least we live in a body where we can make those arguments and make them in whatever manner we wish to.

I have mentioned previously the opportunity to learn that I value so highly here. There are many special caucuses here and great opportunities. One of them I would like to mention in particular is the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future, which

was led for a long time by our now Senator AL GORE, and our colleague, BOB EDGAR, is now the head of it. This is where Members meet once a month and bring somebody in to tell us what sort of problems they see coming at us in the future. If there is one thing I think we need to do in Government, it is to try to look at the future and plan for the future more so that just until the time of the next election.

So as I leave this body, I want to thank my colleagues. I want to thank my constituents. I want to thank God.

I took a trip to New Zealand some time ago and as I talked to those people that were legislators in New Zealand, I realized that even though they had these same concerns, that they are not on the stage. They do not have an opportunity to determine whether or not we are going to have a nuclear test ban. We are the ones, the United States and the Soviet Union, that determine that.

They are concerned about nuclear war and they can scream about it and they can do different things, but we are the ones here, our people in this country and the people in this body that are on stage and make that decision.

I thank God that I was born where I could do that; so as I said earlier, where I was born, in my opinion, under a lucky star, it started with being born in this great land of ours. It came from the wonderful opportunities we have from the outdoor world around us, from great parents and grandparents and the brother that I had, for the great family that I have been privileged to have myself. Some of my fondest memories are family trips, family picnics, the family life that we have had. My children are now grown and they have children who are now our grandchildren. Within the last couple weeks, it was great as we drifted down the Shenandoah River with our daughter and her husband and grandparents. It was great this week to go to a baseball game in Baltimore with my daughter and her husband, my wife and our grandchildren.

I have to say, I could not be more proud than I am of my family. I certainly appreciate tremendously the help that my wife, Eleanor, has given me over this whole period. Many times the life of a Congressman is not the greatest life for a wife, but she never ever has complained.

I am thankful to my friends back in the district. I am thankful for the school friends back there, the ones that played basketball and football with me. I was on the varsity of our local football team. I weighed 120 pounds. Football is a crazy game, you know. You get knocked down so you can get up, so you can get knocked down again, so you can get up, so you can get knocked down again.

I always tell people that our forefathers who said all men were created equal were never 120-pound ends trying to push a 200-pound tackle out of the way.

Then I got impetigo and I had to sit on the sidelines and watch my friend out there getting knocked around on the football field, and I realized how much more fun it was to be out there getting knocked down and getting up and getting knocked down again than it was in watching.

I am so thankful that my people have given me that opportunity here in this body to be a part of that game and to be in here. There are lots of heartaches to this job, but it is an opportunity for us really to be in the ballgame, so I am thankful to those friends in the Congress.

I am thankful to you, Chaplain. I remember coming to your office when I had problems. I remember crying in your office and I remember the help that you gave me and I thank you very, very much for what you have done.

So now as I leave the Congress, I have two choices. I could feel sorry for myself. I could feel sorry for myself because due to an illness I am having to leave a job that I do not want to leave and that I have enjoyed all my life, or I can rejoice for myself for the fact that I am now well again and have my health back, and that is an easy choice for me. Certainly the last one is the one I want.

As I do so, I think about my past life. I think about the times when I have been disappointed in what has happened and wished things would be different and how almost always it has turned out that what came about was in my own interest and indeed the Lord knew what was best for me than I knew myself.

So that as I leave this great body, I go forth not knowing what the challenges may be that He has in store for me, but I pray and hope that indeed that challenge is there. I am confident it is, because it always has been in the past.

I go with great memories. I go with great hopes and I go most of all with great thankfulness for the wonderful things that have happened to me in this body and all through my life so far.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEDELL. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, this is in a way an intrusion into the gentleman's special order. I happened upon the scene quite by accident to make remarks of my own, but I was compelled from the gentleman's remarks to hear and to listen intently to what is without a doubt one of the

most beautiful perorations ever delivered in this body.

I have heard so many parting remarks by my colleagues that have been discordant notes, sour tones, on leaving the burdens of office.

This is one of those rare up-beat moments in a Member's final hours in the session. It makes me feel good about America.

If I could add one comment about the service of BERKLEY BEDELL in the U.S. House of Representatives, having come here together with him in that 94th class, the quality that has stood out above all others, my friend, has been your uncompromising integrity that compelled you to say what you have said this afternoon so beautifully, so warmly, and with such deep and powerful meaning and feeling.

I join all our colleagues in that class and in this House in wishing you all the very best, continued good health, service to God and country, that you have given so beautifully in these 12 years in the House.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEDELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, first at the very outset let me say that presiding over the House at the moment that the Speaker pro tempore now was reporting to us upon his eve of departure from membership in the House of Representatives, the most noble expression of sentiments that I have heard from anybody. I wanted to be the first to join in making it clear on the record that I am a Member who has admired and respected your talents, your ability, your scrupulous integrity and honesty, since the day that you were sworn in as a Member of this House.

I had the privilege of serving with you as a colleague on the Small Business Committee and there you clearly exemplified the tremendous assets that you brought to this House and the fact that you have in effect worked in such a way that you have a lasting heritage of your own handiwork in the corpus of legislation that has been enacted that you helped to forge, were instrumental in forging, and which now is part of this vast corpus of law in our country. I wanted to express my profound and sincere regrets that you are leaving this House. I know that not only the House, but the Nation, loses a very, very valuable American, who has contributed so richly and so creatively to the common good.

□ 1420

Mr. Speaker, today, in having rejected the rule that was presented to us with respect to bringing up the amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, the House I believe acted wisely. I was one of those who voted against moving the previous question and against the rule.

I was denied even a half-minute opportunity to speak, by both sides, to whom I went and solicited as much as just half a minute. On top of that, during the deliberation of the Committee on Rules—and I know that it is a difficult task, a challenge—I also had made a longstanding request that I be heard, since it was obvious that the Rules Committee was going to follow a modified or qualified rule and that it would also provide for a select or preselected number of amendments that would be entertained if the rule were adopted.

Since I first came to the House, I have been very much opposed to what we call a closed rule. I remember that my first year here I antagonized the then-powerful chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means by voting "no," even though seldom did we have a vote on adopting the rule. But when we did, I always voted "no." Then later, when we had the electronic system of voting, I decided that the only way that I could vote on those measures that it was impossible to know exactly what it was we were voting for—and I was the one that I believe initiated the practice—was "present."

For a while I was kind of ridiculed, called Mr. Present, and I had some Members say, "How in the world can you go back home and face your voters if you vote 'present'?"

I said, "It's the easiest thing in the world. It's a lot easier than going back if I had voted either 'aye' or 'no' and a constituent had said, 'Why did you vote 'aye,' or 'Why did you vote 'no,' and saying, 'Well, I really don't know. The leadership said that this was OK, but I really did not know what it contained, and I just followed the herd.'"

I said, "It's a lot easier to say, 'Well, the reason I voted 'present' was because I did not know what I was voting on.'"

I think that those who have followed it—and I do not know who would, other than some detractors that have always been around who have been waiting now for about 33 years for me to fall on my face—will note that on the Suspension Calendar in many instances I have voted "present," and essentially for the same reason.

Today, however, was a little bit different, in that I felt that the rule that we were asked to either vote for or against was of such a nature that it would ensure no opportunity for the

membership of this body to participate in the full flow of discussion, in the full give-and-take of debate, and that under those circumstances I would be constrained to vote "no."

On top of that it has been obvious ever since I have been here and have had to consider my vote on immigration matters, and in studying the history, going back to the first codification of 1924, that the Congresses then and the Congresses since I have had the honor of being a Member have always acted out of some fear.

At the turn of the century, of course, the last century, it was the fear of the Middle European, the laboring groups that were allowed to come into our mining sectors in Pennsylvania, and the potato famine brought forth the Irish, who for years and decades faced very severe prejudice and discrimination in the eastern shore of our country. These Middle Europeans from Bohemia, as it was called then, and those from some of the Mediterranean countries, and the prejudices that they in turn faced, always faced the fear that these aliens were going to just absolutely take over the country.

Before and after that it was the Chinese, it was the Oriental.

Then, of course—I consider it a blot, but then I was living through that period of time—I remember and I recall the environment of fear when we placed in concentration camps native-born Americans who happened to be of Japanese descent.

I remember in my backyard the fear of some long-time, sixth-, seventh-generation Americans who happened to live there and still wanted to preserve the language that they had inherited from their forebears, the German language, and who were still printing in San Antonio and in some of the environments where the area had been first colonized about 130 years ago by the first settlers or colonizers that were brought in from Germany. Under the pressure and the psychosis of war that the First World War and the Second World War generated, anybody having anything to do with things Germanic, whether it was his last name or anything else, was looked upon with great fear and suspicion.

Even names were changed. For instance we have a very, very historical—and now very attractive—place in the middle of the city of San Antonio known as the King William's area. But actually, up until about 1917, the name of that area or that street or that avenue was the Wilhelmstrasse—that is, King William's Street. The architecture, mostly good old Texas limestone Gothic architecture, clearly proclaimed the German influence, and even though these groups were the first, that brought the first scientists, such as the first botanist, to Texas,

and the like, all of that is forgotten. We have these orgies of fear and xenophobia which it is easy to generate in our country. It is very easy to arouse fear and hatred for things foreign, as we consider it.

This is true in the case of those coming and proceeding into our country from south of the border. It always has seemed so. Here in this environment always the number of Representatives from that border area of any descent have been an extremely small number until relatively lately.

For example, I was the first of Mexican descent elected from Texas to the Congress. I was the first of Mexican descent elected to the Texas State Senate since the State was created, right about the time of the Mexican War, about 1847. So, therefore, the history and the conditioning factors and the historical involvement of these areas are completely unperceived, either during committee deliberations or during what we call debate, or on any basis that I have seen on an intellectual basis here in the North. As I put it, we are facing here—and I remember the early sixties—I compare the environment here to what we faced in Texas and in San Antonio 50 or 60 years ago. Little by little, though, perhaps there will be an awareness.

When the immigration amendments are considered, even if all of these bills were accepted as written, and with all of the amendments that have been proposed, it would have not one whit of an impact on the problem, because the amendments do not address the cause at all. As some of us have been saying for more than 30 years, unless and until the two countries—in this case the Republic of Mexico and the United States—actually get together on a binational basis, as difficult as it may be, it will really not be substantially resolved. Yet these amendments, and the thrust of the bills that have been approved in the Senate and in the committees in the House, have absolutely no reference to anything like that.

□ 1430

Some of us have advanced for 30 years specific proposals at some period. At some period we have the favorable response on the part of the national leaders in Mexico, as I did in 1984, when the President of Mexico was here and endorsed what I call the United States-Mexico Economic Development Bank, patterned on the institutions that we have formed for some years that we call regional financial institutions. This would be instead of multinational, it would be binational.

However, this administration would not even look at the proposition. As a matter of fact, when the serious financial crisis first reared its ugly head in

September 1982, exactly 4 years ago, this administration, neither the Secretary of the Treasury, nor, for that matter the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, wanted to take cognizance at all. Instead, they have done things, as we have seen history reveal we have done.

But my point today is to point out a little bit of history and show how if we want to know what our antecedents are we do not look to our dealings, even historically, with what we call generally Latin America, but over in China. At the turn of the century, the United States, its financiers, the Morgan Bank, the Kuhn Loeb investment bankers, the then First National City Bank of New York, the First National Bank of New York, now they are one entity and at that time they were two separate entities, decided that they were going to make a direct thrust into China.

At that time, the Manchu dynasty was on its last legs. The Boxer Rebellion, which took place at the turn of the century or thereabouts, was the first manifestation on the part of the Chinese that they were revolting against the continuing colonial influence and control, mostly of the European entities, but to which the United States was coming in.

So along about 1910, finally, and 5 years or so after the disastrous Japanese-Russian War, the United States bankers had finally penetrated the Manchu dynasty. The Emperor was kind of old, feeble. The dynasty was in serious financial trouble. Its currency needed some stabilization.

So the bankers from the United States figured this was a good time to move in, particularly after that Asian war between Russian and Japan. You will remember Japan has always looked to the Chinese Mainland as its natural sphere of influence, so that to make a long story short, around 1910 they finally put a package together from which would come the building of a railroad line from Chinchou to another point in the Continent which would in effect compete with the old Manchurian line, which had been and was under the control of the Europeans, and for a while also the Russians, and their ally at that time, the French.

So the United States did reach the point where they finally extracted an agreement and the Manchu dynasty agreed to it, and it was going to be on the basis of a loan, and it was going to be mostly American bankers loan.

But at that point, Russia and Japan were brought together by our penetration of that area of the world, just as years later in Indochina, when we went to war both in Korea and in French what used to be called French-Indochina, which we call Vietnam, we again bought the Russians and the Chinese together, even though they

had been at war with each other for over 200 years.

But our perception, and the perception of our leaders of that world and other parts of the world was just as misguided and misperceived as the present leaders in our country misperceive Latin America and even Europe, not to throw in Asia to begin with.

Has we had the correct perception based on an historical, historical knowledge, and some understanding of the culture and the language—we must always remember that all during the Vietnam conflict we did not have one American diplomat, one American intelligence agent, one American Government employee in or out of the State Department who could speak Vietnamese. We must also remember that all our Presidents have been monolingual, which is something that has aroused a very, very tense situation even with the European countries. Even such German leaders as Helmut Schmidt, for instance, could get on TV and radio and speak as well in English as President Carter.

But the day of the monolingual President, my contention is, is gone if America is going to really acquire the leadership that it is entitled to have. Whether the American people abstain from the polls or not, I think we will discover that this is the crying need.

But if we had had and our leaders had had a correct perception of the reality of that world, I do not think we would have lost 58,000 Americans and untold treasury in what we call Vietnam. I am convinced of that.

But I rise today because the immigration bill also as proposed thus far takes no cognizance of what is happening over here. Some factors of which this bill ought to take notice of, caused by what I consider to be the mistaken and misguided actions, I will not even dignify it with the word "policy," but actions of the Reagan administration under the insistence of President Reagan, which in effect have created for the first time in our part of the Southwest United States an influx of as many fleeing from Salvador, for instance, where we have sponsored such things as what we used to call in Vietnam hamlet pacification, where we have with our attack Huey helicopters killed and continue to kill, even as I am speaking today, innocent old women, old men, children, and peasants. It is our ships. Nobody yet has proven that Communist source of armanent has even gotten there, even though this was a pretext for the quarantine or embargo and for President Reagan deploying the heaviest massive military presence in the Isthmus, on both sides of the Isthmus in the history of that part of the world.

□ 1440

Remember the reason given? The first 3 years, 4 years? That was to interdict the villainous transportation of weaponry from Nicaragua to El Salvador.

Not one time did anyone ever interdict any such transportation. You know that, had such a thing happened, it would have been a headline in our newspapers for 3 weeks in a row.

What I am saying is that these mistaken perceptions as to what has happened; what is boiling, churning, just south of the border. You do not even have to go beyond our very next country: Are such things that ought to have our attention or at least reflected in the legislation we are trying to perfect here on a unilateral basis; at least we ought to provide for some effort to move along the creation of a binational commission on the part of the United States and Mexico.

Even though we now are seeing temporarily receding from the front pages the question of Nicaragua, the question of El Salvador, let me assure you in a matter of a few weeks they will be in the headlines. They will be. Those circumstances, those events that will bring about what I believe President Reagan will not change his course on, and that is a direct intervention in Nicaragua.

The reason for that is, as in the case of the so-called Bay of Pigs attempted invasion of Cuba that nobody wants to sit down and ask the hard questions. Those hard questions are: What is going to happen even if you do succeed in knocking out these regimes?

In the case of the Bay of Pigs, suppose that group, which was really a very motley group put together, sailing in ships that belonged to United Fruit that were armed for the occasion. Let us suppose for a moment they had succeeded in physically knocking out the Castro forces.

Who would have governed Cuba? Not that group. They cannot even get together among themselves in Miami; and they were not willing to stay in Cuba and fight against communism in their own homeland.

It is the same thing with those at yesterday's continuing resolution on appropriation provides \$100 million. Well, we are being told by the President that there is just no way he can find \$60 million for the homeless in our country, that there is no way he can find \$50 million for grants in aid for rural communities to have below market interest loans, not grants, but the grants as a help to finance loans for the construction of sewage lines, water systems, while the infrastructure of our country is collapsing around our ears.

Who is the \$100 million going to? It is going to a group that is not in rebellion in Nicaragua against whose

present regime they are fighting; they are hiding out in the neighboring country of Honduras that we are occupying and compelling them to give protection to and be host the rebellious group.

At no time has the assembly of Honduras ever invited the United States—we have taken over because for years and years and years it was United Fruit, now known as Standard Brands, that has run that country, owned that country.

It is the chief owner of that conglomerate that now owns Standard Brands who is the biggest adviser shaping those policies that surround Mr. Reagan.

Now these are things that are now well known. It was the same thing with China at the turn of the century. Who knows now that in 1910 this pact was put together, but the French and the British, who were allied respectively with Japan and France with Russia said, "Hey, wait. Unless you let us in on the act, you're not going to get anything."

So that by 1912 they put a package together. In the meanwhile, Woodrow Wilson was elected our President. They put a package together that involved the Deutschbank of Azotisch, and they put together with the help of the English bank, the trading company and English bank of Hong Kong and Singapore and Coon and Lobe of the United States; the Morgan, First City, and National Bank of New York, and the French Banc de Indochin.

The terms were that they would, in exchange for the loan, in order to enable the Manchu dynasty in power to stabilize its currency would be that these bankers would have a stranglehold on all of the economy of China. They would have the right to all of the proceeds as a matter of mortgage derived from the tax on tobacco, on production, and consumption.

The American financiers, Morgan, and others, wanted the U.S. Government to kind of come in and give its blessings. So they went to President Wilson, and Wilson wrote a most notable reply to them. He said, "No, because you in effect are violating the sovereignty of China, and I cannot tolerate that. This is an infamous arrangement, and I will not give the approval of our Government."

However, in 1914, World War I broke out. Russia was soon out because of its revolution. Germany, which had literally taken possession of one of the provinces in China, Shantung, withdrew. So the Japanese, with Vicount Ishi, coming to the United States, had a secret agreement made with Secretary of State Lansing in which Japan and the United States agreed that they would share the Chinese fear of influence.

Who would have thought that later when we were at war with Japan that

this secret treaty or secret agreement—it was not a treaty because it did not come to the Senate, but it was a secret treaty, just as secret as the ones that President Nixon, via Henry Kissinger, entered into in the Middle East, half of which have yet to be divulged.

One of which was the Kissinger deal made in Paris in 1973 that was supposed to have put a stop or a truce in Indochina, but which only brought the Northern Vietnamese or the Communist regime, because they received a letter from President Nixon saying, "If the Congress goes along, I will pledge, in exchange for your cease-fire, not less than \$3 billion in reconstruction aid" for the damages presumably we had caused.

Well, reconstruction is a fancy word for reparation. All of the European press called it reparation. I was the only one in this Congress that reported it as reparation. I asked the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations then, a fellow Texan. He said: "I don't have any knowledge of any such thing."

No published American report referred to any such deal. It was not until years later, when a colleague of mine from New York then, who was chairing the ad hoc committee on drugs, international drug traffic, had reason to find that, in discussing with the South Vietnamese countries and trying to reason with them to try to stop the flow of the drugs, that he discovered and heard a rumor.

□ 1450

He called me down to Texas and said, "I heard that you had spoken on this." I said, "Yes indeed." I said, however, when the ad hoc committee on the missing-in-action and POW's was formed and I was named vice chairman by the then Speaker, we had a meeting with Secretary Kissinger, who would never come over here to the Congress, we had to go to his Secretary of State office to have breakfast one morning and I asked him point blank to his face if in the agreement in Paris of 1973 there had not been a side memorandum, a codicil, an agreement that we would compensate the North Communist Vietnamese Government. He said, "No, absolutely not." Well, he was telling the truth because he did not do it. Nixon did it. Nixon was the one. He wrote a letter to the Chinese Government leaders who then acceded to the same, the same agreement that Averell Harriman as envoy for President Johnson in 1968 had reached except they would not go that far. So the Vietnamese would not at that time agree, nor would Lyndon Johnson just capitulate.

So that all of this is history but it all bears up to the present. It bears up to the present in Latin America. Where?

In Nicaragua, for instance, not once but nine times within 100 years we have invaded that country. The same Secretary of State that was in power, Secretary Knox, with the Republican regime preceding Wilson's, who was the one who sanctioned these arrangements in China, was the same one that, with the moral influence of a battleship, removed President Estrada of Nicaragua who was sworn to support the constitution they had just adopted that would free them from foreign control. They deposed him and imposed President Dias, with the help of a warship in the harbor. And he then signed under compulsion—well, we could say it was moral suasion, but it was compulsion—the financial agreement with the Brown Bro. financier group out of New York which continued the complete control and domination of that country's not only monetary but fiscal destinies.

With all of this background, it would seem to me that we would realize that there have been vast changes in this part of the world that, as I have said, was a different world when President Kennedy conceived of the Alliance for Progress in 1961. It is not the same world. It is all vastly different, and each year is a greater responsibility on us and our leadership, to make sure that we appreciate the dimensions of this change because President Reagan, unbelievably to me, without even trying the diplomatic approach has resorted to the Calvin Coolidge bankrupt policies of 1929, which I thought Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the 1930's, with his Good Neighbor Policy, has put to rest. It took Ronald Reagan to revise Calvin Coolidge except that Calvin Coolidge lived and acted in a very different world. We could send our marines, keep them there for 9 years or so, impose the national guard, impose the Somoza regime and keep them in power for 40 years. But sooner or later out of its own corruption it was going to collapse. On what side do we want to be? Do we want to be on the side of the aspiring millions now, over 80 million more than our population, which was not true 20 years ago; do we want to be on the side of that irrepressible—because nothing is going to hold them down, they are not going to take the despotism of 300 years, they know the world is different, they know that it can be different—what side do we want to be on? Do we want to be on the side of the despots, the oppressors—which is where we have been—instead of a revolutionary nation, true to its revolutionary founding principles? We have turned out to be the status quo Nation of the world. We have let Russia become the revolutionary of the world. I do not think that is being true to the basic principles of America, which I believe had been watered down quite a bit during our expansion period of time in which

first in 1912-13 President Wilson said, "No. I will do everything in my power to stimulate trade and commerce." But what he was saying was, "I am not going to give the power of our Government to the bankers." What has happened since Reagan is that instead of going to our men of commerce, to our traders, to our men of business, he has turned it over to the bankers like the Republican regimes did at the turn of the century. That to me is simply unbelievable, but one which I have denounced here time after time because it is also applying the same type of plantation economics on our country and on Americans.

It is these interests that once they reach the multinational, megacorporate level, made the decision to sell out the farmer, to sell out the laborer, to put American laborers on a footing with every slave-laboring country in this world today. It is this regime, and by their fruits you shall know them, for the first time since 1914, in the last 2 years we are a debtor nation. For the first time in our history, during the last 1½ years we are importing more food into our country than we are exporting. In the meanwhile we have created the rust belt out of what used to be the belching furnaces of the steel mills, what used to be the production lines of our automobiles. That is gone, it is gone. The monstrous, unbelievable \$175 billion trade deficit, that was not Jimmy Carter's, that was not Lyndon Johnson's, that was not Gerald Ford's, it was not even Richard Nixon's; it is Ronald W. Reagan's and nowhere else, try as he will to blame somebody else.

What do we get? Do we get leadership to confront that? Absolutely not. Let us bury it. Let us have this smoke-screen of an antidrug war; let us keep the American people over here until the election anyway, but let us not face these basic, impelling issues that the American people are entitled to have leadership on, not only in the White House but in the Congress. But our Government is of such a nature, it is supposed to be a Government of three fundamental basic organs of Government, each independent, separate and coequal. But you would not think so today.

I think the average American thinks the President is supreme. And the way we have had Mr. Reagan treated in the press, you would think that he had royal infallibility, could make no mistake. And if he does, he is not accountable; somebody else somewhere ought to take the fault but not he.

We have entered an era in which I consider the basic issues confronting any nation in the 20th century, demand and impel a confrontation with those issues, some attempt to try to resolve them for the sake of the destiny and continued involvement of this Nation.

I do not think that the American people have intended that their Representatives abdicate their constitutional authority, responsibility, privileges, and immunities to the executive branch. I do not believe that the American people ever intended, and since the adoption of the 1913 Federal Reserve Board Act, that we create such a monstrous giant that is not accountable to anybody.

Even in our taxwriting, yesterday we had the unbelievable scene of the chairman of the taxwriting committee getting up and giving credit to an unselected, little-known clerk hire in the committee for having been the one that really had written the bill. It is incredible. It never was conceived that this is what the American people would bargain for. At least I do not think that was the understanding I had when I sought and the people went along and elected me to this job, which they have since 1961. I feel very keenly about that.

But there is no awareness of it here, there was no discussion whatsoever about what we, the Representatives of the people, have been abdicating.

The other example followed less than 24 hours after yesterday's vote on the tax bill, and that was the rule today on the immigration and naturalization bill, which I started out discussing this afternoon.

I believe that, if the American people had a chance, they would say, "Mr. Reagan, we don't want war, yet we have provided \$100 million for that purpose." There is no question in my mind that in less than a matter of weeks you will see headlines in which every American, including us, will be saying, "Oh, yes, Mr. President, you have no alternative, you had better go in there with soldiers."

You will see headlines: Mig's in Nicaragua, American soldiers attacked in Honduras. That is all it is going to take. And Mr. Reagan believes that time is on him. He has until 1988 to prove like he has proven, according to him, in Grenada and in Tripoli, that Americans still know how to make war and win war.

But unfortunately, all history reveals these ironies. In fact, books have been written about the follies of mankind and its leaders all through the centuries. As I see it, the President has been embarked on a catastrophic course in Central America. Do not even mention Mexico, which sooner or later will be on the front pages. There is so much we can do, there is so much we ought to do which, left undone, will leave us no recourse as to what will be possible for us to do in later dates.

My position has been this, and I have been saying it for not 3, but 4 years: The President has chosen to embark on a unilateral military interventionist course in Central America,

that that will lead us into something that up to now we have been spared, and that is the Europeanization, the sowing of intractable hatreds in this New World.

We will be dooming our children, our grandchildren, our great-grandchildren to hatred, animosity and war for decades to come.

All of this is unnecessary.

Do we have the leadership now that President Roosevelt had in his Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Sumner Welles? There was a man. He was the architect of such things as the Good Neighbor Policy.

He also wrote the definitive history of Santo Domingo. He had knowledge. He knew what he was talking about. Fortunately, the leader was great enough to know that his chore at this stage in American development as President was to seek first-class minds, surround himself with them, orchestrate them and, in his words, lead this vast army of the American people in a common assault on those problems commonly facing us all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1505

A NEGOTIATED SOLUTION TO TIMBER PRICING IS POSSIBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEDELL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss some potentially very exciting developments as far as possible solutions, to working out some of the problems relating to timber pricing between this country and Canada.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago when Secretary of Commerce Baldrige was before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, I encouraged the United States and Canada to avoid an impending trade war by resolving their pricing discrepancies before the countervailing duty decision comes down on October 9 of this year.

It seems that the Canadian Government is getting the message, based on some of the news reports we received very recently. As reported, for example, in the September 24 Prince George Citizen of British Columbia, a news outlet, there is an indication the Canadians are considering a new approach to resolving the longstanding timber pricing problems that we have had between our country and the Canadians. The new approach that is being discussed now would include a combination of cut-level reductions, increased minimum pricing and also

using more current data in pricing formulas. The result could be a possible 30-percent increase in the Canadian Government's stumpage receipts, which is about, Mr. Speaker, the amount of the present discrepancy.

Obviously, a negotiated solution would be preferable to a tariff trade war. But, at the same time, the United States cannot sit by and quietly tolerate unfair trade practices.

Some have suggested that the countervailing duty case that is currently before the International Trade Administration should be withdrawn if the Canadians were willing to negotiate. I am not convinced that a step like that would be wise at this time, because it seems to me that giving up any of our negotiating tools could be a mistake.

Now in our hearing today in the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, the U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Yeutter, in responding to questions that I asked, indicated that he had met again yesterday with the Canadians as far as trying to resolve the timber-pricing issue, and that it was the position of the United States Government that indeed between now and October 9 there really was a possibility, if there was an effort on all sides to push hard and to work for a negotiated agreement. I certainly found that encouraging. Now, Mr. Speaker, I learned that the Canadians are expected to give a timber proposal to the Department of Commerce and the United States Trade Representative next week.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that should this proposal be a good-faith proposal, a substantive proposal that provides real solution, certainly real short-term solutions, it might be appropriate at that time for Secretary Baldrige to consider a suspension agreement with the Canadians. Such a suspension agreement would just suspend any applicable tariff until the final ruling were to come down on this matter on December 31, 1986, and it could be revoked at any time. Such a suspension agreement could provide valuable time for the United States and the Canadian negotiators to work through the short-term approaches and focus on the long-term.

I will say again that there has been some discussion on the part of some that perhaps this countervailing duty case, now before the International Trade Administration, would be withdrawn perhaps if something like that, the suspension agreement, were to go forward. I could not support something like that. I think small timber operators and others in the Northwest who are so concerned about this issue would also have great reservations.

It would seem to me that if the proposal that comes forward next week from the Canadians is a good-faith proposal, we could meet it with good faith on our part by looking at a sus-

pension agreement, and indeed a good-faith proposal by the Canadians should be met with good faith on our side, even though I do not think we should go so far as to take away a major additional tool of having the countervailing duty case withdrawn as some, particularly in Canada, seem to be interested in.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I think we still ought to look at the major long-term approach that could be constructed and resolve this once and for all, and that would be a question of common stumpage pricing. While the Canadian plan that has been discussed at least in the Canadian price at this point might provide some short-run parity, there really is not enough, in my view, to encourage equality over the long run. It would seem to me that if we could look at a common stumpage pricing arrangement, and particularly do it now at a time when exchange rates between the United States and Canada are relatively stable, that if such an approach could be developed, then the United States and Canada, natural allies, could team up and go out and try to tap the Pacific Rim and worldwide markets in timber.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I think on the basis of some of these late developments that a negotiated solution to our trade disagreements in the timber area with the Canadians is a possibility. I very much hope that our official trade representatives will act and act quickly to try to make that kind of negotiated solution in the timber area a reality.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WYDEN for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUNGREN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PARRIS, for 5 minutes, on September 29 and 30.

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on September 29.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PEPPER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, on October 1.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 60 minutes, on October 2.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WYDEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAY, for 30 minutes, on September 29.

Mr. RAY, for 30 minutes, on October 1.

Mr. RAY, for 30 minutes, on October 2.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 60 minutes, on September 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, on House Joint Resolution 738, continuing appropriations, 1987.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LUNGREN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McGRATH.

Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. CHAPPIE.

Mr. THOMAS of California.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. COBEY.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. CARNEY.

Mr. SAXTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STOKES in two instances.

Mr. ATKINS.

Mr. FLORIO.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1935. An act to authorize the coastwise operation of certain passenger vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2750. An act to establish a property tax fund for the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians in furtherance of the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 26, 1986, through November 1, 1986, as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to designate the month of October 1986 as "Learning Disabilities Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2294. An act to amend the Education of the Handicapped Act to reauthorize the dis-

cretionary programs under that act, to authorize an early intervention program under that act for handicapped infants and toddlers and their families, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 29, 1986, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4264. A letter from the President, National Safety Council, transmitting a report and financial audit for 1985 and 1986, pursuant to Public Law 88-504, section 3, (36 U.S.C. 1103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4265. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of the independent certified public accountant's audit of the Postal Service's accounts and operations (GAO/AFMD-86-72), pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 2008(a); jointly to the Committees on Government Operations and Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3352. A bill to transfer certain real property to the City of Mesquite, NV; with an amendment (Rept. 99-897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5496. A bill to designate certain National Forest System lands in the State of Georgia to the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 99-898, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5508. A bill to designate the Sipsey River as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, to designate certain areas as additions to the Sipsey Wilderness, and to preserve over 30,000 acres of pristine natural treasures in the Bankhead National Forest for the aesthetic and recreational benefit of future generations of Alabamians, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 99-899, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 565. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey, without consideration, to the Town of Payson, AZ, approximately 30.96 acres of Forest Service lands; with amendments (Rept. 99-900). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOWARD: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 5568. A bill to establish uniform standards for testing

and licensing of operators of commercial motor vehicles; with an amendment (Rept. 99-901). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAZZOLI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5559. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 99-904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5558. A bill to amend title III of the Immigration and Naturalization Act to provide for administrative naturalization, and for other purposes (Rept. 99-905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAZZOLI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3737. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to deter immigration-related marriage fraud and other immigration fraud; with an amendment (Rept. 99-906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAZZOLI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4823. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 99-907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5546. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Vaccine Program for the development of new vaccines and the improvement of existing vaccines and a program to compensate the victims of vaccine-related injuries and deaths, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 99-908, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. UDALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5192. A bill to establish an emergency response program within the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; with amendments; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period ending not later than October 3, 1986 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendments as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(m), rule X (Rept. 99-902, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5540. A bill to encourage good faith professional review activities of health care entities, to require collection and dissemination to hospitals and other health care providers of information concerning certain payments in medical malpractice claims and certain adverse decisions, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Judiciary for a period ending not later than October 3, 1986 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendments as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(m) of rule X (Rept. 99-903, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4712; H.R. 4712 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5217; H.R. 5217 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNARD:

H.R. 5603. A bill to provide relief to State and local governments from Federal mandates; jointly to the Committees on Government Operations, the Judiciary, and Rules.

By Mr. BATEMAN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. PARRIS):

H.R. 5604. A bill to allow the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to be applied and administered as if the 3-year basis recovery rule applicable to employees' annuities had not been repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAPPIE:

H.R. 5605. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 5606. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the naturalization of alien service members who enlist outside the United States and who have not been admitted for lawful permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.J. Res. 741. Joint resolution to designate March, 1987, as "Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 565. Resolution electing Representative HANSEN of Utah to the Committee on Armed Services; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WALDON:

H. Res. 566. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should accept the invitation of Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda to meet with the black leaders of the six front-line states that border South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 693: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 4439: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MOORE, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 4450: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 4783: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 4792: Mr. MCCAIN.

H.R. 5099: Mr. AU COIN and Mr. HENRY.

H.R. 5196: Mr. COATS, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 5257: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 5413: Mr. MORRISON of Washington.

H.R. 5432: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 5477: Mr. KEMP, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 5490: Ms. OAKAR and Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.R. 5509: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. WALDON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. DAUB, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. KOLTER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 5532: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. WALDON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 5537: Mr. DAUB.

H.R. 5538: Mr. MRAZEK and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr.

DUNCAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McKERNAN, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARLENEE, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. SHAW, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. PURSELL.

H.J. Res. 524: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.J. Res. 550: Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. STOKES, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CARR, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, and Mr. BARNES.

H.J. Res. 602: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 615: Mr. SHARP, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. RUDD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WOLFE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. REGULA, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. DREIER of California.

H.J. Res. 643: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. LENT.

H.J. Res. 677: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. SABO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, and Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 735: Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. WOLF, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H. Con. Res. 336: Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRUCE, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. EARLY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MAVEROULES, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SABO, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WOLFE, and Mr. WYDEN.

H. Res. 556: Mr. WYLIE.